DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 076 EA 017 712

AUTHOR Kimbrough, Ralph B.
TITLE Ethics: A Course of Study for Educational Leaders.
INSTITUTION American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, Va.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 94p.; Approved by the Ethics Committee.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, American Association of School Administrators, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, VA 22209-9988 (Stock No. 021-00139; $8.95 plus $2.50 shipping and handling; quantity discounts; orders of $20.00 or less must be prepaid; prepaid orders over $20.00 will not be billed for shipping and handling).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Principles; *Administrator Responsibility; Adoption (Ideas); Behavior Standards; Codes of Ethics; Critical Thinking; Cultural Influences; Decision Making; *Educational Administration; *Ethics; Integrity; Moral Values; Traditionalism
IDENTIFIERS American Association of School Administrators

ABSTRACT

This monograph provides readings in ethical thought and professional ethics in educational administration, supplemented by case studies illustrating ethical problems administrators face. Comments on the field of ethics and the importance of administrative ethics introduce the booklet, along with background information about the booklet and suggestions for its use. Three chapters present the bulk of the discussion. First, obligations of administrators are identified, including legal obligations, "obligations of form," commitment to professional excellence, avoiding conflict of interest, formality, justice, loyalty, prudence, and whistle-blowing; the need for a binding code of ethics is argued. Second, traditional sources of moral values are discussed, including cynicism, hedonism, sophism, stoicism, and Machiavellianism; the idea of the "true believer" is also noted. Third, conflicting strains of ethical thought, and their development and implications, are examined. The chapter covers the institutionalization and acceptance of moral philosophies, the exercise of pure reason, revelation as a source of ethics, naturalistic moral philosophies, ethical systems based on empirical study of society, experimentalism, logical positivism, utilitarianism, existentialism, and other moral philosophies. Following a conclusion that summarizes the previous 3 chapters, appendixes present 18 case studies and the American Association of School Administrators' code of ethics. (MCG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256076

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Henry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 017 712

ETHICS

A COURSE OF STUDY FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

Ralph B. Kimbrough

Published by
The American Association of School Administrators
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209 9988
(703) 528-0700

Approved by the Ethics Committee of American Association of School Administrators

The American Association of School Administrators
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209-9988
(703) 528-0700

Stock No. 021-00139
Library of Congress Card Catalog Number 85-70228
Copyright © 1985 by the American Association of School Administrators

The points of view expressed in this book are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the AASA.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION....1
Ethics as a Field of Study and Practice....1
Importance of Administrative Ethics....2
Use of These Materials....4
Collecting the Information....4
Using the Material....5
CHAPTER 2: SELECTED OBLIGATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS....7
Legal Obligations....7
Obligations of Form....8
Authority....8
Responsibility....10
The Caring Function....12
Character....13
Commitment to Professional Excellence....14
Conflict of Interest....15
Formality....16
Justice....17
Loyalty....18
Prudence—Common Sense....19
Whistle Blowing....20
Professional Ethics....21
CHAPTER 3: TRADITIONAL SOURCES OF MORAL VALUES....23
Custom and Tradition....23
Cynicism as a Standard....24
Hedonism: The Pursuit of Pleasure....25
Sophism: The Worldly Wise....26
Stoicism: The Impassive Ethic....27
Machiavellianism....28
The True Believer....29
CHAPTER 4: CONFLICTING SOURCES OF ETHICS....31
How Moral Philosophies Influence Us....32
The Exercise of Pure Reason....33
Revelation as a Source of Ethics....36
Naturalistic Oriented Moral Philosophies....36

The Realists....37
Experimentalism....39
Emotivism: Logical Positivism....40
Utilitarianism....41
Existentialism....42
Other Moral Philosophies....44
Situation Ethics....44
Ethical Relativism....44
Ethical Egoism....45
CHAPTER 5: TIME FOR A NEW EMPHASIS....46
The Scope of Administrative Obligations....46
Traditional Sources of Moral Values....47
In the Realm of the Ethicist....47
APPENDIX A: CASES IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION....49
APPENDIX B: STATEMENT OF ETHICS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS....82
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS....85

FOREWORD

After several years of encouragement from students and associates, Ralph Kimbrough developed a proposal to collect and write a set of materials for a study of administrative ethics. He selected the case study method with a formal discussion as perhaps the best approach to a complex subject.

From the beginning this has been a cooperative endeavor of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), and the University of Florida. Subsequent discussions resulted in formal approval for this publication by the AASA Ethics Committee and the AASA Executive Committee. The Executive Committee of UCEA also endorsed the proposal as one of its several cooperative projects. Funds for two graduate assistants, secretarial service, and office expenses were provided by the University of Florida. AASA provided the funding and staff to publish the publication, and the AASA Ethics Committee provided guidance in producing the manuscript. William H. Price and John C. Wahl were the graduate assistants who helped in preparing the case studies and in other aspects of the project.

AASA believes firmly that ethical behavior is an important part of the administration profession. Actually, ethics marks the cornerstone of many professions. For that reason, AASA published a Code of Ethics, originally in 1966, with a revision in 1976 (See Appendix B), and the Association continues to encourage its members to follow such precepts in their professional capacity.

We hope this publication provides additional guidelines for administrators who are faced with making some tough decisions that do not always have rules providing easy answers.

—The American Association of School Administrators

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

To many, the mention of ethics may conjure up acts of immorality that sometimes include sex or money, but acts of immorality frequently mask underlying sins. In commenting on a television movie, *The Thornbirds*, a Catholic bishop observed that, wrong indeed as the main character's sexual behavior was, his most serious act of immorality may have been his selfish, opportunistic pursuit of power and authority regardless of the feelings and welfare of those in relationships with him.

Likewise, more highly publicized acts of immorality among educational administrators may focus attention away from other unethical acts that produce irreparable damage to many students. Sensational acts of unethical conduct are usually dealt with swiftly: culprits are fired, their licenses rescinded, and their futures as educational administrators ruined. Yet, in those same school systems may be lazy principals who do not care about the well-being and educational opportunities afforded their students. This unethical conduct is usually not dealt with swiftly and indeed, if the principals "stand in" politically, may be tolerated until retirement.

Most of us have come across school administrators who do not care. Nevertheless, the caring function is a hallmark dimension of administrative ethics. When administrators cease to care about the welfare of those for whom they provide leadership, they very likely demonstrate unethical behavior.

The point of this discussion should be apparent: Administrative ethics covers a variety of behavior that may be judged moral or immoral. In this book we will discuss the meaning and dimensions of administrative ethics taking into consideration the various categories.

ETHICS AS A FIELD OF STUDY AND PRACTICE

The term ethics refers to the study of values concerning how we ought to live. In a formal study of ethics the term is often used interchangeably with moral philosophy. The primary endeavor of an ethician or ethicist is the systematic study of the nature of values regarding the "good," "ought," or "right." Their aim is to achieve validation of moral principles for the good life through stated formal processes.

What is ethical, moral, or immoral becomes an engrossing central thrust of organized religions. In fact, many people equate what is "right"

and "wrong" behavior with religion and perceive ministers as their ethicists.

When ethics is considered apart from formal studies in philosophy or religious experiences, it refers to common-sense behavior, professionally acceptable behavior, or acceptable rules of conduct. Common-sense behavior may be defined as those unwritten everyday judgments that school administrators feel constrained to make apart from the endeavors of ethicists, the statutory provisions of law, and written policies. All educational administrators participate in making hundreds of common-sense judgments every year.

In addition to common-sense decisions, there are codes of behavior, sometimes established by professional organizations. For example, AASA has published a Code of Ethics (See Appendix B). Individual schools and colleges may publish written codes of conduct; other codes are included in congressional acts, legislative statutes, state regulations and local school board policies.

How does etiquette relate to administrative ethics? Even though most people do not view slovenly manners as synonymous with moral character, failure to observe acceptable etiquette may contribute to a perception of unprofessional conduct. If a school superintendent attempts to eat peas with a knife, he or she may be viewed as a bit uncivilized but not immoral; however, if the same person is rude toward subordinates, serious questions may be raised concerning the superintendent's professional conduct.

The obligation to observe acceptable behavior in such areas as manners, ceremony, and punctuality falls in the ethics of *formality* category. Other problem areas in the ethics of form include authority, caring, conflict of interest, justice, prudence, responsibility, loyalty, and "whistle blowing" (See chapter two).

IMPORTANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ETHICS

Each year many parents in our nation commit to the care of school administrators their most precious possession, their children. The parents have the right to expect that their children will be treated with dignity and fairness by school personnel. These parents also have the right to expect that the administrators will set examples of high moral standards. Accepting an administrative position also carries an obligation to be decent, caring, law abiding, and honorable.

Why would any intelligent, competent administrator commit a foolish act such as embezzlement? Certainly it is not because of a lack of intellect

or administrative ability because he or she wouldn't have attained such a position without those abilities.

Does elevation into high office make educational administrators more vulnerable to immoral conduct than average citizens? Probably—people in top administrative positions are targets for those desiring favors and offering advantages: free hunting trips from school equipment companies, gifts of nice coats from athletic houses, and other offers bordering on bribery. Also, there is a tendency for some people in high places to adopt an "above the law" concept—power tends to corrupt. Thus educational administrators have a special need to observe high moral standards in the face of multiple temptations.

When any type of administrator lapses into immoral, unprofessional conduct, everyone loses. There were no winners when Richard Nixon resigned. When educational administrators commit acts of misconduct, the damage to the organizations is frequently accompanied by passage of restrictive statutes and board policies that place additional burdens on the innocent. The school board loses credibility and prestige, and the impact on students when someone they admire fails is incalculable.

In other words failure to live up to acceptable standards of morality and professional ethics does not harm merely the culprit. The profession is tarnished, the school system is hurt, and everyone associated fails a little with the person who fails. Public support is weakened; consequently, students lose educational opportunities, and the situation is most grave when a top executive is involved.

I believe, though, the most serious damage does not come from visibly unethical acts. The greatest damage may be done by acts, unethical in nature, that will go unpunished under the law. For example, a school principal who spends an inordinate amount of working hours playing the stock market rather than doing his or her job demonstrates irresponsibility and violates the duty to offer leadership for a good school program, to say nothing of the conflict of interest that exists. Yet, a principal may commit such an unethical act for years and retire without incident. A superintendent who does not care about the quality of education in the district, whose primary aim is to keep his or her position provides another illustration of possible unethical behavior that, though not illegal, robs children of their right to the best education possible.

The sole purpose of ethical behavior is not merely a nicety that educational administrators ought to observe just to be good but it has economic consequences as well. Unethical behavior has a serious economic impact. Children who are deprived of educational opportunities because adults

fail to assume their obligations for leadership pay for the rest of their lives.

The process of adjudicating or otherwise dealing with instances where administrators have not done their duty or have committed immoral acts is very expensive. This expenditure in administrative time and money represents a loss to the main purpose of educating children. The decline in morals traced to what children learn from immoral adults seriously impacts the economic opportunity and quality of life for all.

USE OF THESE MATERIALS

For several years preservice students and practitioners in educational administration have expressed interest in learning more about administrative ethics. Rapidly changing conditions during the past two decades have precipitated feelings of insecurity among many educational administrators concerning personal and professional ethics. Behavior that would have meant certain and swift expulsion from a job in 1960 may not be considered grounds for removal now.

Court decisions during the late 1970s and early 1980s have brought significant changes in student rights. Recent emphasis on public disclosure and openness in the conduct of public business has presented administrators with unfamiliar dilemmas. Consequently, the traditional administrative ethic, which has been passed informally from one generation of educational administrators to another, is no longer completely dependable as a guide to administrative behavior.

Yet, perusal of college and university course offerings will reveal practically no formal preparation in administrative ethics for preservice students in educational administration. Furthermore, this topic seldom appears in the inservice training agendas for educational administrators. Except for a few special publications, textbooks in administrative ethics have not been published and, in fact, ethics is largely ignored as a topic in textbooks in the field. Although AASA had enjoyed more than a 100-year history, it did not adopt a code of ethics until 1966.

Therefore, this publication, timely and necessary, should be useful in both preservice and inservice education programs.

COLLECTING THE INFORMATION

Much of the material for writing the case studies in this book was collected from practicing school administrators. The mail and the telephone were the primary means for collecting information. Selected school

administrators were invited to participate by sharing their experiences involving administrative ethics. A letter requesting information was mailed to appropriate officials in state departments of education that indicated possible activity in the field of administrative ethics. Only two of the states selected provided adjudicated decisions from which cases were developed. Most of the selected states reported that no adjudication process was in force. Obviously action is needed to correct this situation, because an important attribute of any profession is an enforced code of ethics.

Although the cases included in Appendix A are based on collected data; fiction is employed liberally to protect any identities. The location of cases is disguised and fictitious names are employed. *In the event any of the names used in the cases are the same as names appearing in similar cases anywhere, the similarity is coincidental.*

Because of space constraints, only 22 cases were selected to depict recurring areas of ethics discussed in chapter two. These cases should be supplemented by using cases from other sources: University Council for Educational Administration, Inter-University Case Program (ICP), and the Harvard Business School.

Including the introductory chapter, the body of the report contains four chapters. Chapter two includes a discussion of the obligations of educational administrators. Chapter three identifies selected traditional sources of values for behavior. In chapter four the ideas and persuasions of ethicists are discussed because administrators must finally rely on some of the same processes as an ethicist as a guide to behavior.

USING THE MATERIAL

These materials should be useful in both college preservice preparation programs and inservice education for practicing educational administrators. Experience indicates that a seminar on the subject should be part of college programs; however, the instructional materials may also serve as a course supplement. A school district could use large and small study group techniques, presenting the information to the large group. Small groups then study the cases, followed by a return to the large group for a presentation and discussion of small group work.

A primary objective might be to sensitize preservice students and practitioners to the importance of ethical behavior and to provide them with introductory knowledge about administrative ethics. Whereas I will not argue with the question of whether a dishonest person can be led to embrace intellectual honesty, sensitizing unprofessional people to the impor-

tance of ethics for success might prevent them from ill-advised behavior.

Much has been written about the teaching of values and the development of morals in children. Kohlberg's work in this area for children is well known (1976). Development of moral competence in adults is a neglected area of research. Weinreich-Haste and Locke presented a review of the literature on the development of moral behavior without offering a comprehensive solution to the problem (1983).

There is no substitute for reading and thinking about ethical responsibilities and obligations. Obviously, it is important to understand and observe a professional code of ethics. Second, a person must invest time in individual study and reflective thought about personal beliefs concerning correct behavior. Of course, a cooperative study of ethics is important. These materials should be used in group consideration of moral behavior.

Finally, this publication represents the cooperative efforts of the University Council for Educational Administration, the American Association of School Administrators, and one of our state universities. I believe that this sort of cooperation should be expanded as a means of increasing professional development in the field. A viable college preparatory program inextricably tied to the needs and experience of practitioners is essential to the development of a profession. Otherwise, we are at the journeyman stage in preparation for a trade.

CHAPTER 2

SELECTED OBLIGATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS

People in administrative positions assume special obligations not necessarily incumbent upon members of the faculty and noninstructional employees of a school system. This does not mean that faculty members do not have some of the same obligations. They do. Yet, the obligations for administrators are more demanding and administrators are more visible. Two categories of administrative obligations are discussed in this chapter: legal obligations and obligations of form.

LEGAL OBLIGATIONS

Administrators' legal obligations fall under what Cooper calls objective responsibilities, which include all "expectations imposed from outside oneself" (1982). Briefly, school administrators have an obligation to carry out the law relative to the operation of educational programs. This includes congressional acts, statutes of the state legislature, and case law. School superintendents, for example, cannot ignore the requirements of PL 94-142. They must see that the law is followed.

Since the early 1960s school administrators have experienced fundamental changes in legal requirements, especially in case law, affecting administrative behavior. Moreover, legislatures have become more active in passing specific requirements. Obviously, school administrators must keep current in their understanding of the law to observe the requirements of the laws.

School administrators must follow state board rules and regulations and school board policies. Acting in consistency with the rules of the organization is also obligatory.

Those who assume a skeptical defiance of the law may question an emphasis here on upholding the law. Some of the laws and policies governing education in a complex society will always be objectionable to some citizens—for example, sex education, the pledge of allegiance, or notices of abortion clinics in school newspapers. Yet, in a democracy, everyone has a right to use the system to seek change in laws or to seek redress of grievances in the courts. In fact, in accordance with standard six of the AASA Code of Ethics, administrators are obligated to seek corrections in laws that are inconsistent with sound educational goals.

The essential question an administrator must ask is whether society can exist in its complex state through reliance on tradition and custom in the absence of law. An unsophisticated society marked by homogeneity of ideology and custom may be able to do so, but relying on custom in a complex society invites chaos.

OBLIGATIONS OF FORM

There are recurring facets of administrative ethics which, for want of a better term, are referred to as obligations of form. This seems appropriate because such terms as character, caring, and loyalty imply a behavior in a certain shape, mold, or form.

Authority. Authority and responsibility, troubling terms in all administrative fields, have been the subjects of endless debates and the basis for many charges of unethical conduct. One frequently hears expressions critical of an administrator: "He exceeded his authority"; "She failed to fulfill duties assigned to her"; "He passed the buck." Legal terms, such as nonfeasance, misfeasance, or malfeasance, may describe the improper use of authority and responsibility.

—*Ethical Problems with Authority.* Authority is often defined as the power to influence the behavior of others. School principals, for example, are given authority to act officially (for example, to make teaching assignments) within the scope of the powers delegated to them in their school district. In the Weberian bureaucratic model, administrators are clothed with specified legal-rational powers to act—in other words, administrative authority is delegated by law, regulation, and policy.

Actually, many scholars contend that real authority depends on the willingness of subordinates to accept the decisions, directives, and suggestions of their superiors. In reality, then, administrators have authority if subordinates do what they ask them to do. If the teachers in a school decide to reject a decision announced by the principal and take the consequences, the principal does not have authority. For this reason many scholars adopt Barnard's observation that authority builds more from the bottom up than from the top down (1938). That is, legal-rational authority depends on a "zone of acceptance" by subordinates. Those who do not follow directives can, of course, be charged with insubordination.

Problems often arise in use of authority because an administrator, for whatever reason, is viewed by subordinates as unprincipled. Arbitrary use of legal-rational authority to push employees around as in a game of

checkers may be viewed by subordinates and possibly other superiors as uncouth, inhuman, and uncaring. For example, a pugnacious "boss" who demeans the secretary is not only unprofessional, but also loses respect and authority and generates widespread resentment.

Similarly, laissez-faire administrators who fail to use authority and "fiddle while Rome burns" are as unethical as administrators who use authority to abuse underlings. "Passing the buck" is, unfortunately, present in most organizations—the object being to save "one's own hide" rather than assume responsibilities commensurate with authority of a position.

Excesses both in the arbitrary use of authority or in failure to exercise authority effectively, therefore, represent failure to meet acceptable ethical standards. An administrator who delights in bullying employees does not really respect the dignity and worth of people. Case 6 may represent an arbitrary use of authority because the administrators may have acted on insufficient evidence and failed to observe due process in suspending students. On the other hand, Case 4 illustrates an administrator who fails to exercise authority when responsible use of authority might have made a difference in the future effectiveness of the organization. Cowardice in the use of authority in the face of powerful special interest groups is unethical.

—*Conflicts in Authority.* Several of the cases demonstrate the troubling problem of a conflict of authority. Case 16 demonstrates the plight of an administrator caught in the vice of bureaucratic conflict of authority. It is difficult to criticize the administrator in this predicament who is being pressured unmercifully into an action in conflict with his or her own authority. Likewise, the superintendent's experience in Sears City (Case 4) illustrates a conflict in authority between the board of education and the school superintendent, complicated in this case by a powerful "authoritative" political group.

Those who obtain and maintain authority through favors, bribes, serving as lackeys, or using other divisive means are seldom viewed as ethical. Likewise, those who "sell out" or otherwise subvert authority in the face of conflict lose stature because "having character" is an important aspect of being ethical.

Answers concerning how to deal with conflict in authority are not easy. Nevertheless, administrators must cope with these inevitable conflicts. One big city superintendent stated that in his first superintendency he was intimidated by the board of education because he felt that he had to have a job to exist. He decided that he would not be successful unless

he found a way to make himself economically self-sufficient—which he did. His answer to coping with conflict of authority represents only one of many that have been voiced at professional meetings. Each person must seek and use the answer with which he or she is most comfortable.

Responsibility. Responsibility is very closely related to trustworthiness, reliability, accountability, and answerability. It connotes the quality of being responsible for carrying out one's obligations and duties to an organization, group, community, state, nation, and so on. Being responsible means being answerable or liable for legal review. It means that if people are given assignments and the authority to perform administrative roles, they must exercise the necessary responsibility. Responsibility falls under two dimensions—objective responsibility and subjective responsibility.

—*Objective Responsibility.* Cooper defines objective responsibility as "obligation to someone else for a particular standard or category of performance" (1982). Some examples of these obligations include:

1. Upholding the constitution, laws, regulations, policies, and observing job descriptions
2. Observing the rules of the organization
3. Implementing directives of superiors and passing decisions to subordinates necessary for efficient and effective administration
4. Acting in conformity to the normative expectations (or expected role) of position held
5. Upholding professional standards
6. Serving the public interest.

Objective responsibility includes all of the external constraints and obligations placed on a person holding a given position. As stated previously, administrators are expected to observe all laws and state regulations relating to the operation of schools. The policies of the board of education should be followed. As a school principal one does not, except possibly in a dire crisis, attempt to usurp the authority of the director or vice versa. Organized activity is based on the allocation of roles or understood job descriptions and responsibilities.

The public holds certain role expectations of people holding administrative positions, and administrators have obligations to behave consistently with their expectations. In this respect the personal lives of

school administrators may become intertwined with their professional lives. For example, high school principals are expected to be sober, law-abiding citizens who support community norms. Other types of instructional personnel may experience more freedom in their personal lives and appearance, but administrators are expected to restrain emotional feelings under pressure, observe acceptable grooming, and dress appropriately.

As discussed, objective responsibilities are imposed externally from a variety of sources. But what about responsibility for laws that are unconstitutional (for example, racial segregation before the 1950s)? Should administrators follow authority that demands unethical behavior (such as changing the grade of a star athlete)? The answers to these questions bring the discussion to subjective responsibility.

—*Subjective Responsibility.* Cooper contrasts objective and subjective responsibility as follows:

> Objective responsibility arises from legal, organizational, and societal demands upon our role as public administrator, but subjective responsibility is rooted in experiences like loyalty, conscience, and identification. We feel inclined, or even compelled, to act in a particular way, not because we are required to do so by a supervisor or the law but because of an inner drive (p. 51).

Much of the discussion in chapter four concerns ethical standards of individual beliefs and convictions relating to subjective responsibility. Individual beliefs may also rest in certain traditional sources of ethics, discussed in chapter three. Subjective responsibility is derived from feelings or beliefs about what is right behavior. Therefore, people often face difficult conflicts between what they believe is right and constraints imposed from external sources. And what can the administrators do when they receive orders that conflict with their ethical beliefs or that require unprofessional behavior? School administrators are frequently caught in the middle of conflicting moral values. It's an old dilemma. The nursing students in Case 3, for example, were in such a position.

Answers to many of the questions raised by conflicts between objective and subjective responsibilities are complex. If administrators receive direct orders to perform an act that is personally repugnant, obnoxious, and distasteful, should they refuse to follow the order? The answer to this and similar questions must come from a person's conscience and be based on personal values. Fortunately, even in the most stressful of these situations, and depending on the philosophic bases of their values, administra-

tors usually have more than one choice.

One rather obvious option, and one frequently employed, is to resign rather than carry out an order that an administrator feels is wrong. Another option is to refuse to follow the "wrong" order and take the consequences. If the order is based on board policy or law, this may become a difficult alternative—that is, unless one feels strong action may result in a change of policy.

During the 1960s, civil rights leaders adopted the concept of civil disobedience to oppose laws they felt were wrong. Use of civil disobedience is a hotly debated issue. Some administrators contend that they must survive to fight again, which means that they follow the "bad" order but gather support to change the defective policy. For others, this is a "cop-out." Regardless, administrators must, particularly in the event of heavily supported policies, decide whether their personal convictions are right.

An acquaintance once confided, "I learned a long time ago that if the community rejects a pet project that I think is absolutely essential, I had better examine my idea to see whether I am right, and if I am not right, change my idea." Just thinking an order is unethical is not a good basis for taking the serious step of resignation unless the administrator has considered all the available evidence.

The Caring Function. Education literature is replete with admonitions that administering educational organizations is a people business. When educational administrators display an uncaring attitude, some students and staff members may be damaged for life.

An uncaring attitude is more prevalent in schools than most educators would like to admit. There are illustrations of educable children being neglected and shunted into paths that result in denying them an education. Cases like the noted "Peter Doe" case in California raise serious questions of whether administrators and teachers always care. AASA publications *Champions of Children* (1979) and *Building Public Confidence in Our Schools* (1982) emphasize that educational administrators should care. Case 5 illustrates how administrators may care for the wrong objectives.

One mark of an uncaring person is a tendency to use others to satisfy one's needs for self-aggrandizement. School administrators are subjected to a variety of temptations to use others. In recent years we have had revelations of the exploitation of athletes, particularly in university settings, so that a school could set winning records or win conference championships. The administrators in charge know very well that many of these athletes cannot possibly succeed in college; yet, they are enrolled

and used by the colleges and fans alike.

Parasitic relationships also illustrate uncaring attitudes. There are instances in which administrators "latched on to" capable people and do everything in their power to prevent their moving to other opportunities. These administrators become angry when competing organizations offer these people a big job. In fact, some administrators have been known to give unsatisfactory recommendations in an effort to hold on to their "man Friday."

Domination is another example of uncaring behavior. Parents, teachers, principals, or others who dominate are not only inconsiderate but uncaring as well. A caring person delights in seeing others move toward control of their own lives.

Good educational administrators help those in the organization to grow and develop into maturity because they care. Caring involves commitment, patience, knowledge of the needs and desires of others, and certain amounts of tolerance, trust, hope and courage (Mayeroff, 1971). Administrators who care listen attentively to the problems expressed by students, teachers, parents, and others rather than opening and reading the mail or engaging in other distractions during conversations. They feel that the welfare, growth, and development of people is foremost in the organization. Everyone in the school "counts" and all avenues are used to ensure personal growth and development.

Character. Just what does it mean on a reference form when a request is made for an opinion about an applicant's character? Usually, the form refers to the moral or ethical aspects of a person's behavior. If a person is said to have "good character," the reference is usually toward behavior marked by honesty, courage, dependability, and generosity—a person with acceptable motivations or of honorable repute. When such people act in unexpected ways, we often say they "acted out of character."

To summarize, character refers to what we observe as the sum of behavioral qualities that lead to definitions of "good" or "bad." "Ebenezer Scrooge" is bad, not because of one or two undesirable qualities, but because of the sum total of his character attributes. Most of us revere the strong character of national heroes such as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Thomas Jefferson. This is not to say that we are unaware of their limitations; we realize that they were not infallible. When we say people have character, we mean they are worthy of our respect and admiration.

Since the term character refers to an integrated, complex set of emo-

tional, intellectual, moral, and personality traits, how do we determine good or bad character? The test of character appears to be how we are perceived by others. Character refers to an integration of characteristics and values. A person said to possess strong character demonstrates great stability in those qualities most admired in the society.

Many consumer advocates, for example, have great admiration for Ralph Nader because he could not be compromised by the automobile moguls. Good character is an earned quality in the eyes of those who work, play, and live with us.

COMMITMENT TO PROFESSIONAL EXCELLENCE

Those who prepare for and enter educational administration should be committed to excellence. This means a personal commitment to four areas:

1. Preparing for entering the profession
2. Contributing to the development of the profession
3. Keeping abreast of current research throughout one's professional career
4. Working at an optimum level.

Personal commitment begins when a person begins the preparation process for becoming a licensed administrator, but commitment to excellence does not stop with graduation and certification. This is merely the beginning. Professional administrators are obligated to stay current in their fields. Professional commitment means studying professional journals; attending local, state, and national meetings and seminars; participating in research activities; attending academy training sessions; and participating in numerous other inservice opportunities. The aim is to raise competence to a level worthy of respect.

Professional excellence also includes an obligation to contribute to developing the profession. Practitioners have made outstanding contributions to knowledge in the field of educational administration. C.I. Barnard's work, *The Functions of the Executive*, is one of the most quoted books in administration (1938).

Participation in professional activities and professional associations encourages excellence. Administrators should also support political leadership that works toward improving the effectiveness and status of their profession. They should also pledge to support and defend the aspects of their profession consistent with high professional ethics.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

When a public official's personal interests achieve priority over public interest, the official may be tempted to use the public office for private gain. This serious ethical problem involves conflict of interest. Clearly, as Cooper stated,

> As fiduciaries of the public interest, public administrators are responsible not only for managing their own conflicts of interest but to some extent those of peers, subordinates, superiors, and private citizens as well.

When a person accepts an administrative position, whether in a public or private school system, he or she assumes a special obligation to serve the public unselfishly. John Doe, the private citizen, cannot mix with John Doe, the public administrator, even though the constituency may have a tendency to mix the private John Doe and the public John Doe. For example, Harry S. Truman prided himself in maintaining a distance between Harry S. Truman, President, and Harry S. Truman, private citizen. Yet, he created a furor when he mailed a handwritten letter to a critic of his daughter's singing ability. School officials must exercise great care in mixing the two.

Some curious norms exist in connection with conflict of interest. For example, the public may accept the behavior of a big time university football coach advertising brand name products for personal profit. Yet, if university presidents performed these advertisements, they could be dismissed. Activities involving personal profit raise serious questions of ethics, even for coaches of college football teams.

Bribery is a common form of conflict of interest, one which most administrators would avoid. Unfortunately, unthinking administrators may become victims of bribery through the influence of agents selling products to schools. The bribery may take the form of vacation trips, consulting arrangements, discounts on purchases, use of equipment, gifts, lavish entertainment, and other exchanges for favors. Conflict of interest could include mutual employment of consultants, for example, "I will use you as a consultant if you, in exchange, use me as a consultant." Of course, an unscrupulous example of bribery could be the acceptance of payments for appointing people to specific positions.

Nepotism or awarding jobs, contracts, and other favors to relatives represents a conflict of interest situation, too.

Case 15 demonstrates the revolving-door phenomenon. In this case, teachers used expertise and materials gained through public employment

for personal profit. Revolving-door arrangements may be on the increase.

Outside, part-time employment frequently results in a conflict of interest if the outside employment encumbers the administrator's time, resulting in a loss of energy for the public position. To illustrate, a school principal who runs a construction company may not have the energy to be effective as a school principal.

Another serious conflict of interest may involve use of privileged information for private gain (See Case 21). In a rapidly growing school district a school superintendent could use knowledge of future locations of schools as a basis for real estate profitable speculation and of course, using school business for personal gain constitutes conflict of interest.

FORMALITY

Formality refers to being in compliance with accepted norms of behavior and ceremonies. It includes keeping personal appointments, promptness, courtesy, language, manners, and attention to ceremonies. An administrator's uncouth behavior can be just as damaging to school districts as failure to follow accepted protocol is damaging to diplomatic relations between nations.

Disregard of time commitments to meetings and appointments indicates lack of appreciation or respect for others and, in the absence of valid excuses, represents an affront to those involved.

Many administrative responsibilities are ceremonial, involving observance of established protocol. Graduation exercises, presentations of awards, dedications of schools, and similar ceremonies must meet public expectations. Courtesy in interaction with pupils, teachers, and other citizens indicates respect for and consideration of others.

Finally, there is the importance of language and manners. Manners may, of couse, be evidence of courtesy, but manners and language are important to school administrators because they represent the whole profession.

Behavior that casts the entire profession in a bad light is unprofessional according to the AASA Code of Ethics. Foul language, improper dress, and violation of reasonable manners reflect badly on the profession. Perhaps of more immediate importance, the educational organization is denied leadership. Most people simply will not follow a "slob" regardless of other qualities that may be apparent.

When the multiple qualities of formality are met, the result is an education leader with, for want of a better term, presence. An administrator observing responsible formality with poise becomes a distinguished

leader who is respected and appreciated. In Cases 2, 8, and 17, the administrators could have set higher standards of formality and presence.

JUSTICE

Many decisions made by school administrators involve an obligation to observe justice. Decisions made by school principals about minor discipline problems involve justice as do decisions school superintendents make about placement, promotion, and teacher assignments. Even in the most minor disciplinary infractions, administrators need to exercise balanced, impartial judgment.

Administrators must seek to avoid favoritism or prejudice because they can impact on a staff's motivation to help students learn. Perception of administrative injustices was an important incentive in teachers' resorting to collective bargaining during the 1960s and 1970s. Many teachers consider grievance procedures an important protection against any perceived miscarriages of justice. No matter how small the number of actual incidences of injustice, administrators must take care to maintain equitable and just behavior toward staff members.

Whereas injustice may involve decisions based on racial prejudice or sex discrimination, faulty reasoning can result in injustice. Case 6 illustrates ambivalence to facts and disregard for due process.

What are some hallmarks of justice in the practice of administration? Obviously, to be perceived as just, administrators must be viewed as impartial, fair, and reasonable. They also need to display balanced judgment and competence in a reasonable exercise of administrative discretion. Just administrators champion educational opportunity for all regardless of race, sex, or social background. Amid all the push and shove of special interest groups to use the schools as instruments for their political objectives, educators advocate the rights of these groups to express their views; however, they resist attempts to use the schools as propaganda tools by any group. School administrators must exercise a fair, reasonable approach particularly in districts caught in policy crises and political upheavals, and avoid the singlemindedness and fanaticism of conflicting groups. Injustice inevitably results in increased opposition and loss of credibility.

Sometimes administrators have to make highly emotional decisions affecting people's lives, decisions on tenure, promotion, or merit pay. For some making these decisions is so heartrending, they do not choose administration as a career. But, for the administrators who pursue the course and make the tough decisions and leave most people satisfied with the

outcome, one of their most distinguishing characteristics can be expressed by saying, "they did their duty."

LOYALTY

Loyalty has always been a troubling concept for educational administrators. Case 11 involves administrative loyalty. Several of the other cases also touch on the concept.

Loyalty refers to faithfulness, devotion, allegiance to a leader, person, group, ideal, cause, duty, and so on. It is a stirring and unifying force. Political loyalty nurtures nationalism. Time-honored customs—singing the national anthem, presenting the national colors, saying the pledge of allegiance—appeal to and nourish political loyalty.

Yet, unreasoning loyalty to people may lead to dangerous fanaticism. The Nuremberg Trials, for example, emphasized that unquestioning loyalty to superiors is not always morally or legally justifiable.

Members of organizations frequently experience a conflict in loyalties. For example, a school principal may be asked to do something by a superior that the principal believes is unethical—for example, placing the mayor's daughter in a certain classroom inconsistent with established placement policy.

As with political loyalty, organizational loyalty is an essential and unifying quality. When school superintendents think about the qualities of subordinates, the question of their loyalty inevitably occurs. Likewise, subordinates frequently ask themselves how much loyalty the superintendent has for them. Will the superintendent stand behind them in a crisis situation? In each organizational crisis, loyalty is tested. Loyalty is considered a desirable quality. On the other hand, how does an organization avoid loyalties leading to blind devotion, fanaticism, or deification of people?

As with other values, the good or bad of administrative loyalty depends on whether it is blind devotion or thoughtful allegiance to ideas and persons. Uncritical, blind devotion to a person (for example, the school superintendent) or an idea often leads to unethical behavior, particularly if the person at the top holds a low standard of morals. Thus the catch is whether the loyalty is to a person or organization having defensible values.

Unreasoning loyalty to another is not even productive. If all the people surrounding a leader are "yes people," the organization suffers serious loss of responsiveness because the top leadership cocoons itself from feedback and closes itself to ideas. Administrators who perpetuate cultish, un-

critical, worshipful loyalty do not respect the worth and dignity of others, which is unethical.

Of course, loyalty based on critical, reasoned devotion to people, groups, ideals, purposes, duties, and so on, is essential. Loyalty of the right sort in an organization allows people to explore, question, create and express their ideas without being considered disloyal. They observe an acceptable standard of ethics as part of their reasoning devotion to ideas, purposes, and each other. Loyalty is a two-way street, not only should subordinates exhibit loyalty to superiors but also superiors must exhibit it to subordinates. However, there is not support in an organization for those who consciously commit unethical acts. Thus, like leadership, loyalty is not inherent to a position. It must be earned.

PRUDENCE—COMMON SENSE

Educational administrators are expected to exercise prudence in personal and professional actions. In the first edition of his general textbook, Mort (1946) described prudence as

> The ability to regulate; to calculate; to employ skill and sagacity in the management of practical affairs; to exercise caution and circumspection; to use foresight, that is, give due regard to the future; to employ forethought, that is, give due consideration to contingencies—in substance, the capacity to exercise wisdom as the outgrowth of experience.

Outstanding administrators exercise prudence in their professional and personal behavior. This is the special ability of thinking through, of not acting until critical data are available, and then moving before time to act runs out. Many observers refer to prudence as common sense.

Educational administrators must remember that their actions have influence on people. Rash decisions and actions, without full consideration of data or alternatives, have no place in the profession because they could result in grave mental and physical harm to students and faculty members. Imprudent administrators might settle for a minimum level of legislative support when a maximum was possible. With them, situations under their command often get out of hand.

Common sense is a virtue deeply engrained in our society. Beginning with Benjamin Franklin's *Poor Richard's Almanac*, the cop on the beat, the president of a corporation, and a first grade teacher are expected to exhibit common sense. Common sense defines what any reasonable person in charge would do in a situation given the knowledge available to them

at the time of a decision.

What can we conclude, then, about how prudent administrators act? When educational administrators are trusted by their constituency for prudence, some or all of these qualities are present:

- Exhibiting foresight, sagacity, and skill in performing basic administrative tasks—for example, school finance, personnel, curriculum and instruction, school plant facilities, and so on
- Considering data and alternatives within the time frame available for action
- Observing precautions
- Exhibiting emotional control even in crises

In several of the cases in Appendix A, we have to question the prudence of some of the administrators. For example, did the school principals in Cases 13 and 14 demonstrate foresight?

WHISTLE BLOWING

Exposing to public view people who are guilty of wrongful behavior—gross waste of resources, violation of laws, disregard for rules and regulations—is painful but essential. Unfortunately, too many people view whistle blowing as an act of disloyalty. That is, an employee who exposes or "rats on" a dishonest boss quite often runs a risk of public scorn, loss of trustworthiness, and the wrath of colleagues.

This is unfortunate because it is an attitude based on the idea that organizational loyalty is restricted to loyalty to people. Loyalty to the ideals of an organization is of paramount significance. Therefore, the person who, in deference to cherished ideals of ethics, exposes a crooked boss is loyal to the organization but not to the boss. This action represents an attempt to protect organizational integrity and demonstrating loyalty to the organization. Thus a whistle blower's personal motivation is important. Did he or she expose the wrongdoing for the good of the organization, or was the act based on the ulterior motives of a disgruntled employee?

Whether a whistle blower acted from personal interest or from moral conscience, administrators are obligated to see that justice is done and that the integrity of the law and the organization is upheld. Every report of wrongdoing must be considered, regardless of source. Administrators who are interested in a high level of ethics must concentrate on the message that wrongful acts are alleged to have been committed instead of

"considering the source." Obviously, messages from a "sorehead" may be regarded more lightly than messages from a highly trusted employee. Nevertheless, all messages must be considered.

All of us are obligated to expose immoral behavior. Whitewashing or otherwise concealing wrongdoing is itself unethical. Initially, depending on the seriousness of alleged misbehaviors, administrators should attempt to correct the behaviors inhouse. They should bring the matter to the person's attention for minor violations with an expectation that corrections will result.

Inexperienced people may not realize that their actions are questionable. If the behavior persists or is a gross violation of ethics, an administrator must report the evidence to "higher-ups" in the organization. If corrections are not made and those involved are not disciplined, one must face the prospects of "going public" with the information. This is, of course, a very serious decision and the whistle blower should have documented evidence to support any charges of wrongdoing.

In summary, administration involves making judgments, including those about possible wrongful behavior. Organizational channels should be open for employees to express evidence of questionable behavior and machinery should be in place to dispense with reported wrongdoings. Organizations should have established procedures (for example, committees on professional conduct) to consider serious violations. Some states have established active ethics commissions or committees with official authority to receive and hear cases and to remove an offender's license. School administrators have the responsibility to assist in policing their own ranks and exposing those who violate accepted ethics.

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Adopting a code of ethics that is binding on its members is universally cited as a significant step in achieving professional status. Comparing the codes of professions and occupations, Greenwood observed that "a professional code is perhaps more explicit, systematic, and binding; it certainly possesses more altruistic overtones, and is more public service-oriented" (1962).

AASA's Code of Ethics, adopted in 1966, consisted of nine policy statements and an overview statement. In 1976 the Code of Ethics was revised into ten standards (See Appendix B). The Code highlights obligations for making student well-being the basis for all decisions, fulfilling responsibilities with honesty and integrity, protecting human and civil rights, obeying laws, implementing board policies and administrative

rules and regulations, seeking changes in unwise laws, and so on.

All of the standards, with the exception possibly of standard ten, concern the obligation of contract. A professional is obligated to fulfill a contract unless, as the statement continues, one is released by the mutual consent of all parties to the contract.

The penalty for being found in violation of the code is denial of membership in AASA. This penalty does not make the code binding because a person can practice without being a member of AASA. As discussed previously, only two states contacted in preparing these materials had active procedures for enforcing ethical behavior. This is unacceptable. Educational administration will not be recognized as a profession unless control is extended and a binding code of ethics is adopted through state statutes. Violation of the code of ethics should result in forfeiture of a license to practice.

Educational administrators should follow the AASA Code of Ethics or a similar code as a binding code. Whether a school administrator is ethical, however, may be determined by standards that meet the spirit of the AASA Code of Ethics but are not stated explicitly. For example, the caring function and having good character are not expressly stated; yet, they are implied in standards one and two. A professional code of ethics is not designed as a complete standard of morality. For example, such standards as prudence, whistle blowing, loyalty, and formality go beyond the demands of AASA's Code of Ethics, but they are important to administrative ethics. This is true in other professions, too.

In addition, administrators should observe certain professional courtesies. For example, they should refrain from making derogatory public remarks about colleagues or other school systems. A colleague in another school system should be informed of intentions to consider someone in that system for employment. Applying for a position that has not been vacated as a matter of public record or engaging in attempts as a candidate to discredit other candidates for a position constitutes breach of professional practice.

These examples illustrate professional norms that, for the most part, remain unwritten; moreover, these norms vary some among the states. The important thing is to realize that they are operable, to determine what they are, and to exercise some care before violating them and running the risk of tarnishing one's professional image.

CHAPTER 3

TRADITIONAL SOURCES OF MORAL VALUES

Our personal systems of ethics begin forming when we are born. They are urged on us by our family members. We are later influenced by a growing circle of people and groups—playmates, schools, churches, community leaders, and so on. We give individual twists to these beliefs through our life experiences. Perhaps the first time beliefs are challenged is when a person attends college or moves away from home. Unfortunately, many people do not accept the challenges as opportunities to examine their ideas and determine whether a reconstruction of values is desirable. Moreover, given the technical nature of many college courses of study and isolated living styles, many people are never challenged to think seriously about what they believe about right behavior.

CUSTOM AND TRADITION

According to Riesman (1953), many Americans are "tradition-directed" in that they are quite willing to follow customs, accepting them at face value, and never questioning their validity. Riesman wrote that most Americans are "other-directed" in that they follow the crowd sheeplike. These other-directed people were of great concern to Riesman because they are easily led and readily adopt behaviors to belong to an "in-crowd."

Many Americans rely on established customs as a source of moral values. This presents conflicts. By what right do we question the "revolving door" as a conflict of interest (Case 15) or the behavior of John Ledford and Marsha Mills (Case 9) if "everybody is doing it" is the basis of ethics?

Riesman felt that most of us should strive to be "inner-directed" and think for ourselves about ethical behavior. One way to continue this process is to study and think about the base of ethics (See chapter four). The basis for inner-directedness is to think seriously about what we believe and attempt to achieve some consistency of thought and behavior necessary to quell habitual expediency of action.

Many Americans, particularly political leaders, act within a kind of eclecticism; that is, they pray for ethical behavior on one day of the week

and use another source of morality the remainder of the week. Some people can control this approach without resorting to harmful opportunism. Others, though, thoughtfully adopt and study how to improve their cunning opportunistic behavior for self-aggrandizement.

Schools of ethics seldom fade away into obscurity. Although some may recede in popularity, they become part of the warp and woof of society to emerge as popular guides to behavior as events deem appropriate. In this chapter we will discuss traditional sources of ethics as cynicism, hedonism, Machiavellianism, sophism, stoicism, and "true believers."

CYNICISM AS A STANDARD

Cynicism, an ancient Greek philosophy, promoted the idea that virtue is the only good and the essence of virtue is self-control and independence. A cynic is popularly defined as a person wholly motivated by self-interest; however, we are dealing with cynicism, not the cynic. Diogenes, credited with founding the "cult," presented an exaggerated model of a cynic. He depicted the role of privation and vagabondism and denounced pleasurable materialistic values and other conventions of society.

Cynicism has been described by mainstream ethicists as a philosophy of life based on a few dogmas that are unsupported by a consistent system of philosophical thought. Chief among these is belief in a simple life of privation and contempt for the luxurious pleasures, riches, conventions, and wickedness of society. The human-developed conventions of society—government, marriage, economic system, and so on—are really conceited delusions of the good life and propagate a false sense of pleasure. Most people, especially the rich, are, according to cynicism, motivated by selfishness, and most societal conventions are established to further selfish interests.

A cynic's duty is to rid society of its delusions of the "good life" of luxurious false conventions in preference for a self-sufficient, simple life. This allows people to live in tune with their basic natures. Shameless outspokenness against the luxurious living, wealth, rampant materialism, and an anticonventional zeal for reform favoring the simple life are distinguishing characteristics of cynicism.

Some ancient cynics, for example, saw the institution of marriage and family as an unnatural delusion. In the "natural life" of cynicism the relations of men and women might be promiscuous, and the children the common obligation of all. Some of today's communes may express traditional tenets of cynicism.

As is characteristic of all schools of ethics, cynicism takes different forms. For example, some Christians have established sects based on cynicism. Other cynics are atheists. Likewise, their living styles may vary. Because of its aggressive aversion to generally accepted conventions of society, cynicism carries a negative connotation. Consequently, those who delight in aggressive opposition to practically any progressive project in a community are labeled cynics.

During the 1960s and 1970s, elements of cynicism were evident among many in the counterculture movement. A life of privation (living in wornout vans, patched, faded-out bluejeans), anticonventionalism (communal living, a deschooled society), self-sufficiency (leaving home at an early age), and simple living (back to nature in the mountains or on the farm) were coupled with strong demands for reform and outspoken opposition to wealth and luxurious living.

"Cynical" school administrators may see selfish motives in the actions of all colleagues or school patrons. They may view the motives of political figures as self-interested conspirators. Entire books have been written enumerating the federal educational acts that are viewed as a conspiracy by big business to use the schools to solve a variety of economic problems (for example, unemployment among youth). According to this view, even public schools fulfill the selfish interests of corporate society by supplying skilled labor and technical personnel to corporations at public expense.

Consequently, cynically-oriented educators may advocate dismantling large education systems in favor of a return to "simple" education. These administrators quite often have distrustful, disbelieving attitudes toward popular educational practices. As a result, they are likely to be viewed as very pessimistic people.

HEDONISM: THE PURSUIT OF PLEASURE

Hedonism, developed in ancient Greece, establishes pleasure as the chief criterion for the good life. Modern utilitarianism, as revived by Jeremy Bentham in the 18th century, has its roots in hedonism. Different forms of hedonism are popular bases of ethics in the 20th century United States. Since we discuss utilitarianism in the next chapter, only brief mention is given to hedonism here.

Unfortunately, hedonism has been misrepresented by its critics as a view that sentient physical pleasures of the moment are the supreme goal. Although the "drink and be merry for tomorrow we die" concept may have been an extreme form with ancient Greek ethics, sentient physical

pleasure was not the central criterion of hedonists.

Hedonists also recognized the pleasures derived from the arts, knowledge, and friendship—pleasures of the mind as well as the body. Moreover, pleasure was not viewed as gluttonous physical excesses. The hedonist's central theme is that pleasure, not the sacrifice to pain, is the highest good. Finally, the hedonist view expressed today, utilitarianism, is that the highest good is that which gives the most pleasure to the most people.

Hedonistic educators are preoccupied with developing schooling as a pleasurable, happy process for children, youth, parents, and teachers. They attempt to reduce pain to a minimum and emphasize feelings of pleasure and cheerfulness. Inflicting physical pain through corporal punishment would not be tolerated. Hedonistic administrators view stoic acceptance of painful experiences as unacceptable.

SOPHISM: THE WORLDLY WISE

Sophism may be traced to a class of learned itinerant teachers in Greece in the 5th century B.C. These "wise" men offered instruction on a fee basis and emphasized practical subjects—rhetoric, style of oratory, debate, and grammar—that would ensure success in life. Sophists did not accept metaphysics and logic as the basis of absolute truth as did some other philosophers. In fact, they were skeptical of the existence of absolute truth and leaned toward truth in phenomena. Morality was to sophists a matter of opinion. To Greek idealists, sophism lacked a sense of morality, and the sophists were sharply criticized as clever debaters preoccupied with how to win debates instead of how to find truth.

For their emphasis on teaching for success in public service (for example, oratory, skillful debating) and disdain for idealistic metaphysics, sophists were severely criticized by prominent philosophers such as Plato and his followers. Sophism became a word synonymous with charlatanism, deception, and cleverness. Current dictionary definitions define sophism as a captious or fallacious argument correct in form or appearance but used to deceive.

A sophist is worldly-wise, subtle, polished, and appealing. When combined with ulterior motives, sophistication can be a troubling mixture insofar as ethical values are concerned. An element of sophism has always followed salesmanship, which uses clever rhetoric to sell someone something that may or may not be needed. Dale Carnegie's *How to Win Friends and Influence People* has been criticized for its emphasis on skills in establishing close interpersonal relations for the purpose of influencing

people. There is a danger that sophisticates may digress from ethical principles to achieve self-aggrandizing goals.

Worldly-wise or sophisticated school administrators may best be described as urbane, polished, well-schooled, verbal acrobats, who deal easily with many difficult human involvements. They are not as preoccupied with the correctness of logic, theory, or reasoning as a basis of behavior as with success in "getting the job done." Ingenuity, practicality, and soundness of argument—not correctness of purpose—are considered to be ethical wisdom.

Such administrators may be described by their colleagues as pragmatic; however, this is a perversion of the philosophy of James, Peirce, and Dewey because pragmatists maintain a strong interest in the correctness of purpose.

This discussion should not close without recognizing that some educators are engaged in the singleminded purpose of training young persons to have sophist qualities. These persons are not contributing to a sense of right and wrong behavior, but to a sense of polish and cunning in carrying out administrative tasks with suavity, outwitting those who question the way schools are run.

STOICISM: THE IMPASSIVE ETHIC

Stoicism was developed in Greece during the 3rd century B.C. The Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antonius was a noted stoic of the 2nd century. Zeno, an early advocate of stoicism, believed in perfection of nature. True knowledge was what would help humans live in their natural place in harmony with an ideal nature. The stoic ethic was couched in terms of what a wise person would do. To some extent stoic belief in self-sufficiency is consistent with cynicism.

Stoics believe that a wise person lives in harmony with nature, which is the divine order of the universal view giving rise to natural law. A wise person is self-sufficient and dutifully accepts with lack of emotion, poverty, persecution, disease, and many forms of suffering, including death itself.

A good person can not be forced to act unjustly and will be virtuous under the most extreme forms of persecution, temptation, and pestilence. There is a capacity to bear whatever losses fortune may bestow. All people in their natural state have an instinctive disposition to be virtuous, according to stoicism.

In summary, the ethical person has the self-sufficiency to be virtuous even in the most tyrannical and corrupt of educational organizations.

School administrators should impassionately do their duty, unmoved by emotional conditions that may be present. The stoic-oriented administrator keeps a "stiff upper lip" in the presence of extreme expressions of joy or grief—indifferent to both pleasure and pain. Good educational administrators possess the wisdom and restraint that deliver them from the passions and desires that pull toward immorality and disgrace.

MACHIAVELLIANISM

Niccolo Machiavelli is claimed by some to be the first true political scientist because he ignored traditional values in describing empirically how a political leader might collect and use power. In 1532 he pubished his treatise *The Prince* on effective use of power. *The Prince* is still considered the bible of successful political life by many people active in civic affairs. Moreover, in *Management and Machiavelli,* Jay (1967) documented how many modern corporate management techniques are consistent with Machiavelli's pronouncements. What are the basic tenets of Machiavellianism?

One must first see Machiavellianism as an amoral ethic because the central aim was to teach people (in his case, Machiavelli's cousin the prince) how to acquire and use political power. Thus he focuses on political power without referring to the rightness or wrongness of the strategies or techniques. The result is a straightforward set of "principles" unbound by traditional ethical norms that many believe is the basis for political despotism. Machiavellianism has been described by critics as an ethic based on expediency—a cunning, deceitful use of leadership to gain and maintain control over people. As anyone experienced in school organization knows, Machiavellianism is an ethic that is often followed in education. Here are examples of how it is used in school organizations.

According to Machiavellian ethics, school superintendents must have the loyalty of subordinates, especially the top assistants in the organization. Consequently, the superintendent should have written in their contract autonomy in selecting their top administrative assistants. If administrators suspect that any holdover assistants are not loyal, they are dealt with swiftly. For example, an assistant who contended for the superintendent's job must be suspect.

According to Machiavellian ethics, when superintendents have to do something that might be bad for a person, for instance, getting rid of disloyal assistants, they should get the act over with quickly. One strategy frequently employed is to effect a reorganization of the administrative staff. In the process of reorganization, untrusted subordinates are shifted

to frivolous positions that are professional dead ends. Other means of manipulation to gain controlling power over the central staff may also be used, including outright replacement of those suspected of being disloyal.

Machiavelli was especially concerned with how the prince should maintain control over territories. Power-oriented superintendents must, for example, control school principals who manage territories in the organization.

One control method is to transfer principals to other schools to break their power base in the school attendance area. Of course, the transfers are couched in morally acceptable language: "Principals get in a rut if left too long in one school, " or "The transfer is being accomplished for the more effective use of leadership strengths." Most school systems have their "Siberia" schools to which malcontents are banished. These people receive "satisfactory" recommendations as they apply for positions in other school districts with the hope that they will leave. Case 20 illustrates use of this technique.

The crux of Machiavellianism is subtly employing, or brutally if necessary, a "bag of techniques" not only for survival but also for consolidation of power and control over subordinates. These techniques may also be used for upward mobility in the organization and for ultimate power over the entire organizaton. The purpose in Machiavellianism is to amass personal power and use it effectively to reign as a monarch over the organization.

Finally, whether one considers Machiavellianism as ethical or unethical, many people use its principles frequently in large and small educational bureaucracies. Collective bargaining may incorporate use of these leadership methods because it is fundamentally based on who can generate the most political power. Some community leaders or school board members may use Machiavellian-based techniques to exercise control over the educational process.

THE TRUE BELIEVER

In his 1951 publication *The True Believer*, Eric Hoffer, the noted longshoreman-author, popularized the idea of the true believer. True believers have a fanatical faith in a cause and are willing to sacrifice all for it. Traditional constructs of mercy, compassion, equality, justice, and even reason are discarded if they are not in harmony with the panacean doctrine.

Many educators whom we perceive as overly enthusiastic about an idea, a bit obsessed with a practice, or filled with panacean answers to educational problems are true believers. Some of the leaders in the pro-

gressive education movement became fanatical in changing the schools. They were true believers. True believers have an almost religious faith in their causes.

In the first half of the 20th century some educators believed that education would solve all human problems. If we could just give enough support to see that everyone was properly educated, there would be little need for many of the traditional institutions of society. The school would be society's molding force. This belief in education was well expressed in George S. Counts' *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* (1932).

People can be true believers in a variety of causes. For example, true believers in industrial labor unions perceive the union as the answer to all their problems. The union protects their rights, their pensions, their recreation, and their income. During the teacher militancy movement of the 1960s and 1970s, many fanatical leaders in the movement saw labor unions as the solution to all their problems. They were willing to forego traditional ideals of teaching and make personal sacrifices to unionize teachers.

CHAPTER 4

CONFLICTING SOURCES OF ETHICS

Decisions about right and wrong behavior involve different levels of importance and produce different heights of stress. What many people, including administrators, do daily Cooper refers to as the expressive level of venting feelings (1982). For example, vented feelings are the basis of unrehearsed expressions such as "Why did the dummy not notify the teachers?" or, "We ought to give Bill a gold star for being on time." Decisions at this level are not the result of reflection; they are off-the-cuff remarks often sprinkled with unrestrained expletives. Nevertheless, they reflect the values of the person uttering them.

In more serious events, what Cooper calls the level of moral rules is involved. Through years of experience, professional study, and emulation of admired superiors, educational administrators learn a professional culture. Accepted moral prescriptions and proverbial guides concerning right behavior are part of the fabric of this culture. Administrators consider these moral values when they encounter serious situations.

Nevertheless, reliance on prescriptive professional culture for guidance is limited. Administrators are frequently confronted with problems having ethical overtones in which moral rules are not effective guides to behavior. Thus a level of ethics that Cooper labels the level of ethical analysis comes into play. As the label implies, this level involves soul-searching for answers. As Kimbrough and Nunnery expressed it,

> "There is no possible way to program ethical behavior for all situations through written codes of ethics or books no matter how voluminous they may be. Consequently, the educational administrator must, to some extent, be his or her own moral philosopher (1983).

In this chapter we shall visit the realm of the ethicist and what could be referred to as the deep and troubled waters of moral philosophy. Moral philosophies influence administrators both in the personal decisions they make and in the kinds of situations with which they are confronted.

HOW MORAL PHILOSOPHIES INFLUENCE US

Before discussing some of the prevalently cited sources of ethics, let us consider briefly how these conflicting schools of thought influence and frequently complicate our lives as educational administrators. The values derived from a particular school of ethics are promulgated through society's basic institutions. Describing this social diffusion is primarily a function of historians and social scientists. Once a value or an ethical principle crystallizes as the norm in an institution, it has some permanent influence over the behavior of the people.

The emergence of New Left ideology during the 1960s illustrates how an ethic becomes institutionalized and its influence becomes part of the culture. Existentialism was basic to New Left ideology. The emergence of this ethic was not spontaneous; the tenets of existentialism became popular in many families, schools, colleges, and much literature after World War II.

Critics referred to the "permissive" attitudes of parents and other adults during this era. Through the 1960s campus movement, rock music, news media, families, free schools, and politics, the ethic of the New Left exerted influence against other sources of morality in conflict with it.

A major problem, of course, is that within our institutional arrangements is a pluralism of conflicting ethics, and many people assume an eclectic point of view, using bits from several sources. This pluralism frequently results in troubles for administrators, particularly when a school district is sharply divided in political battles over library books, curriculum materials, student conduct, and so on. Every political ideology expressed in these conflicts exemplifies its brand of ethics.

School districts offer very different mixes of ethics. In some, for example, the community ethic is so homogeneous that schools may permit prayer without objection, even though to do so may be unconstitutional. Other communities contain a smorgasbord of ethical practice (cultural pluralism). Developing alternative schools based on different ethics has been proposed for these districts. Many of the alternative private schools that have emerged were based on moral values different from the mainstream.

One may ask, for example, what difference does it make which philosophy a person accepts? Moral philosophy makes a difference, and the difference is reflected in the normative behavior of persons. The ethics of a group is nowhere more evident than in how parents want their children taught. Those adhering to a traditional idealist source of ethics, for example, desire a strict, externally controlled discipline, whereas an ex-

istentialist opts for complete freedom of the individual student to decide what is right. When parents indicate the nature of the education they want for their children, they usually show their expectations concerning right and wrong behavior. With this in mind, what are some of the conflicting sources of ethics?

THE EXERCISE OF PURE REASON

All people probably feel at some time the urge to get away from it all or retire to some "mountain top" to think through a situation. Most of us have our favorite cubbyhole to reflect on affairs. Brief excursions into secluded meditation do not mean that we rely on pure reason as a standard of ethical behavior.

On the other hand, if faith in pure reason, independent of empirical research, becomes our primary source of truth, we may be relying on idealism, frequently referred to as "ivory tower" thinking, as the basis for ethical behavior. Let us examine some of the tenets of those who espouse idealism as a moral philosophy.

Idealism was the accepted philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. Along with the revelation of Judeo-Christian thought, idealism was dealt crippling blows with the emergence of scientific thought and its emphasis on empiricism. Nevertheless, idealism as a basis for moral truths survived the scientific onslaught. Indeed idealism may have increased in respectability in recent years. The humanities as a course of study offer primary support for pure reason as distinguished from the scientific method of the quantified sciences. The humanities have influenced the moral values of society.

Modern expressions of the ethics of idealism are frequently the source of both condemnation and praise. Fundamentalist ministers spend an inordinate amount of television and radio time condemning "humanism." Humanism is the label they use to condemn the idealistic notion that moral truths can be obtained through the exercise of pure reason independent of revelations from God.

Independent moral obligations or what Immanuel Kant referred to as categorical imperatives—the voice of duty, dictate of conscience, sense of "ought"—are not derived from the senses as naturalists hold. These moral obligations, obtained independent of distorting sense experience, are in the part of the mind that processes pure reason. Our senses can tell us what an elementary school is but not what it ought to be. Independent of empirical experience, pure , innate reason can be practical and absolute—the moral obligations universally applicable to action and as certain as a mathematical proof. Concerning Kantian ethics, Durant (1961) wrote:

> And an action is good not because it has good results, or because it is wise, but because it is done in obedience to this inner sense of duty, this moral law that does not come from our personal experience, but legislates imperiously an a priori for all our behavior, past, present, and future. The only thing unqualifiedly good in this world is a good will—the will to follow the moral law, regardless of profit or loss for ourselves. Never mind your happiness; do your duty (p. 276-66).

Norman (1983) suggested that what sociologist Max Weber popularized as the Protestant ethic had a profound influence on Kant and that doing one's duty was the primary focus of his ethic.

> Kant is the first philosopher to put the concept of "duty" at the very centre of ethics. Traditionally the concept refers to the requirements that are imposed on one by one's occupancy of particular social, economic, and political positions—one's duties as a parent, as an employer or employee, as a citizen, as a holder of political office, and so on.

In other words, people are obligated unconditionally to do their duty with reference to the moral laws—the categorical imperatives. The command of moral law is not conditional on actions to achieve an organizational objective. People are obligated to do what is right. They do what is right because they follow the moral law.

In the formal study of ethics, this is known as the deontological view—that is, behavior can be judged right or wrong independent of consequences. Educational administrators who refrain from embezzlement because they are afraid of being apprehended and punished do not deserve praise. The morally good people, who Kant (1964) identified as those of "good will," do their duty because of good intentions; doing their duty for any other reason is not worthy of praise for morally acceptable behavior.

Reasoning, however, is not restricted to pure reason and the absolute obligation to follow categorical imperatives. Many behaviors are based on what Kant named the hypothetical imperative.

School administrators constantly think through, act, and decide matters of everyday circumstances to achieve objectives in the operation of a school system. For example, reasoning about how to get the bus out of the ditch is important but in all probability does not involve a moral decision. Calling off a football game during inclement weather, establishing an appropriate accounting system, and ordering the "best" computer are

hypothetical imperatives—acting to provide means to ends consistent with organizational objectives and do not involve moral law.

It has been said that unanimity of opinions exists in only one place on earth—the graveyard. This is certainly true in ethics. Therefore, scholars embracing intuitive thinking do not agree on everything; the use of logical proofs and debate modify their disagreements. Consequently, attempting to discuss the ethics of all idealists is difficult; yet, some implications are fairly obvious.

Because the fundamental oughts or dictates of conscience are universal (eternal verities), the moral laws of idealism are not subject to situational alteration. Administrators of this bent must observe their dictates of conscience regardless of empirical circumstances. Thus, idealist ethics tend to be strict, and an ethicist would not hesitate to use external means to bring students and other citizens into moral conformity—humans must be saved from their insatiable desires and animalistic behavior. Moral truths are not based on consequences as in utilitarian ethics. They come from the exercise of pure reason. These moral truths do not change and have survived the ordeal of history; consequently, the ethic of idealism is inherently conservative. Idealism has greatly influenced the ethics of educational administration. One measure of this influence is the design of research in the field.

Many years ago Griffiths (1959) expressed concern about an alarming respect for authority as the basis for principles in the field of educational administration. He pointed to widespread use of the jury technique to validate criteria as an illustration of authoritative source of values. Another point he made was the low value ascribed to empirically-oriented research in the field. Unless there have been radical changes, reliance on authoritative opinion is still the basic concept of administrative research, and as a concept, it is more consistent with the processes of idealism than with other moral philosophies.

Individual administrators can assess their approach by asking themselves certain questions.

- In adopting an instructional technique, do you require data from the experimental trial of the technique, or do you accept it on faith of what some authority says?
- In making critical decisions, do you frequently make you decision, independent of scientific evidence, after consulting with a person you consider an authority?

- Do you ever have a "don't bother me with the facts; my mind is made up" attitude?
- Is pure reason a better guide to action than relying on the statistics collected by research specialists?

As you consider these questions for yourself in relation to other sources of ethics, to be discussed herein, try to decide where you put your faith.

REVELATION AS A SOURCE OF ETHICS

From the Judeo-Christian tradition comes the belief that God reveals moral truth directly to people. In this tradition the Bible is a compilation of truths revealed to humans; moreover, fundamentalist Christians assume that the Bible literally reveals and completes the word of God. Other faiths also have writings proclaimed to be revealed truth: the Book of Mormon was revealed to Joseph Smith; the angel Gabriel revealed the Koran to Mohammed. The central theme of Christian ethics, however, was revealed in the life and teachings of Jesus, the essence of moral truths being compressed in the sermon on the mount.

If the source of a person's ethical values comes through prayer, he or she is using revelation as the basic source of ethical values. As most of us realize, this source of values is deeply engrained in the society. Millions of Americans frequently refer to their faith in prayer. In fact, prayer may be a popular source of ethics among educational administrators in the United States.

But ethicists having the same source may arrive at conflicting value interpretations. For example, members of the Jewish faith are split into orthodox, conservative, and reform groups. Likewise, Christians are divided into Catholic and Protestant with additional splintering into smaller groups. Such issues as contraception, abortion, and women's rights further divide followers of a specific faith. Consequently, one could run the gamut trying to get absolute agreement within these boundaries.

NATURALISTIC ORIENTED MORAL PHILOSOPHIES

Those for whom the "other worlds" of idealism and revealed theology (Judaism, Christianity) seem farfetched are most likely candidates for a naturalistic interpretation of ethics. Modern naturalism is rooted in 17th century British empiricism. The pluralistic influence of the Reformation was a given, and many of the scholars of that day were using a scientific methodology to reveal natural truths. The emphasis of naturalists on nature as the source of knowledge and scientific investigation as the basis

of truth is antithetical to the means used by idealists and religionists to discern universal ethics.

Early naturalists, or realists as they are frequently known, perceived the material world as the source of moral truths. Values are discovered in a social context. From the pens of John Locke and Thomas Hobbes and others came expressions providing the basis for the ethics of naturalistic origin. Such slogans as "men are naturally free," "law of nature," "all men are equal and independent," and "life, liberty, health, and possessions" supported the social contract theory of governance.

This naturalist triumph in the popularity of scientific thought over pure reason (idealism) and religion splintered into several bases of ethics. Initially the philosophy of realism held much sway with scholars. In the United States, however, pragmatism or experimentalism—fathered largely by William James, Charles Sanders Peirce, and John Dewey—had a powerful influence. Logical positivism represents still another offshoot of the naturalistic stream of thought. These different views and their ethical sources deserve some discussion.

THE REALISTS

Once the metaphysical "other worlds of truth" is rejected in favor of everyday existence as the whole of reality, the source for all values is nature. Consequently, many sciences—for example, social, behavioral, physical, biological, and so on—enjoy solid acceptance. Realists assume that the truths for right behavior, the laws of nature, are at our fingertips and in a matter of time will be discovered through scientific method and these truths are the basis of ethical behavior in society.

This inductive reasoning contrasts directly with idealism and religion which are deductive. Considering the conflicting inputs of nature, people may question whether it can provide real laws of ethics. For example, in the natural world there exist puzzling mazes of behavior, practices, and "laws" (polygamy, monogamy, fidelity, patriarchy, matriarchy, and so on). How do people know which practice is an ultimate law of nature?

The initial answer to this question seems to have rested on what is called the mode of ethical practice. The mode of ethics is the correct one—all others are deviations from the mode. For example, in decisions concerning what might be pornographic, community opinion or mode of practice may decide the ethic. Of course, a critic could question whether what was discovered is realism and a true law of nature.

This ethic appeared in educational philosophy during the early 1900s when realism was in vogue. Bobbitt (1918) was one of the scholars who

applied scientific study to what should be taught to students.

The answer lay in analyses of practices in society. What mathematical calculations were used? What words were used in businesses, professions, and other societal agencies and groups? Applying science to the task resulted in the 500, 1,000, and so on, of the most used words and the most frequently employed mathematical calculations.

The result was some rather sweeping changes in what was taught. For example, the extraction of cube root was no longer taught because it was not used; moreover, obsolete words were deleted from spelling texts. Critics of this movement referred to it as the "wastepaper basket" curriculum because in many instances the researchers used the wastepaper of banks and other businesses for collecting data. This same process may be used to discover ethics to be taught to students. Bobbitt expressed his strong faith in this process for discovering the right ethical practices

> This requires only that one go out into the world of affairs and discover the particulars of what these affairs consist. These will show the abilities, attitudes, habits, appreciations, and forms of knowledge that men need.

Note how very different this concept is from revelation, which depends on "other world" sources. Perhaps an ethicist of the idealist persuasion coined the hackneyed phrase, "Thirty million Frenchmen can't be wrong, but they are."

Christian ethicists would abhor the "law of the jungle," cutthroat competition, and sinful acts that might bring another "Sodom and Gomorrah." Neither they nor the idealist ethicists have faith that mortal man, acting independent of higher thought from an external realm, can achieve the good life.

Friedrich Nietzsche, the Prussian born philosopher described by Durant (1961) as "the child of Darwin and the brother of Bismarck," pressed 18th century naturalist views to their ultimate. If life is the survival of the fittest, strength is the universal ethic. In the struggle for existence, good is the ethic of those who survive; those who succumb, fail, or perish in the struggle are the weak. Christians who love their enemy and turn the other cheek are the weak. Those who rise to the top in the struggle should rule. The greatest among those at the top, the Superman, decides which values are good. Nazis embraced him as their patron philosopher of truth, but scholars view Nazism as a subversion of Nietzsche's ideas.

Some parents throw their children into violent competition to *build their character*. Character, to them, is the virtue with which a person survives. This ethic, one of the aspects of American business, was built firmly on naturalistic ethics and Adam Smith's economic theory.

Businessmen of the naturalistic ethic are clawing competitors of a self-interest mentality, prone to use any strategy to come out on top. A well-known and politically powerful businessman of this persuasion usually held a party with his top people at the end of each day. The party was started when he held up his glass in a toast and exclaimed, "Confusion to the enemy." This concept, the pursuit of self-interest, is known as ethical egoism.

EXPERIMENTALISM

Although his philosophy is sometimes referred to as pragmatism, John Dewey preferred the term experimentalism. Unfortunately, many educators equate pragmatism with sophisticated opportunism—if it works, it is good; if it does not work, it is bad. Yet, any in-depth study of experimentalism renders this view incorrect. The source of ethics in experimentalism is neither deductive from other worlds nor completely inductive from nature. Human intelligence is the source.

In experimentalism, people have the power to think reflectively, reconstruct experiences, gain new insights, create ideas independent of a supreme being or a perfect realm of ideas, and decide intelligently what is an acceptable ethic. This is a human power and further speculation about it would be unscientific and entirely mystical. Humans are neither slaves to the unchanging revelations of theologians nor the prey to ironclad universal laws of nature. In fact, they can use their intelligence to create laws independent of their discovery in nature and of other worlds. This intelligence is used most efficaciously when applied in consistency with objective processes of scientific investigation.

Consequently, the rules of ethics made by humans are not universal; they are subject to change just as nature changes and evolves. Today's acceptable ethical behavior may not be acceptable tomorrow.

The ethics of experimentalism became widely accepted in American education during the 1930s and 1940s. With Dewey's *Democracy and Education* on hand, the progressive education movement became a strong force for change. Some of the ultraprogressive schools, often the butt of jokes, more nearly resembled the free schools that appeared later under existentialist ethic than they did pragmatic thought.

Their popular slogan was that school is life and that the school should

represent the ideal tenets of American democracy. Democratic administration was the overpowering ethic in education during the 1940s and early 1950s. The democratically-oriented leader was viewed as a success.

Consistent with experimentalist ethics, Appleby (1952) proposed the democratic process as a proper means to establish ethics for administrators. In his view, public morality arrived at through cooperative use of intelligence has a higher status than individual morality. The democratic process is a means through which persons with different sources of ethics can reach general agreements about *acceptable* behavior, not necessarily universally right behavior.

In general, pragmatic ethics is expressed in the liberal ideology of the New Deal and Great Society programs and holds that people become fully human as they participate in society. Freedom is the power of effective choice, and society is obligated to establish a floor of opportunity for all.

Government should provide a floor of support for all fundamental and derived needs, particularly for the disadvantaged. The ideal is to give the poor and disadvantaged enough help, so that they can through their own effort enjoy the fruits of society—the good life. A strong public educational system was believed to be an essential ingredient for an equal chance in life.

EMOTIVISM: LOGICAL POSITIVISM

Somewhat removed from realism's naturalistic determinism and existentialism's relativity is a school of thought known as logical positivism. To the positivist the only true knowledge is that verified empirically, although this has been relaxed to include "in principle" verification. Knowledge is the end state of scientific method. Since normative assertions of "oughts" and "shoulds" cannot be verified empirically, expressions of moral values are nothing more than personal preferences. For example, when a school administrator expresses the belief that students should not cheat on examinations, this is not an empirically verifiable moral value; consequently, the administrator is simply expressing a feeling, opinion, or emotional preference.

Expressions like "teachers should not date their students" or "to steal is bad" are cognitively meaningless, subjective assertions of one person's attitude or emotion. Thus the Ten Commandments were emotive preferences of the Jewish people, and the AASA Code of Ethics is simply the subjective emotive preferences of an organization. The positivistic ethic reduces expressions from the arts to emotive preferences.

Logical positivism, a stirring idea among philosophers, has some followers in educational administration. Because it has not spawned a popular political ideology, we can safely consider it a minority view within society and assume it has no claim for significant implications on the nature of values or ethics.

UTILITARIANISM

Speaking to his constituents gathered at a political rally, a very influential United States Senator explained how he decided to vote on the many bills and amendments offered in the Congress. "When I am deciding how to vote," he explained, "I examine each bill with regard to how many people it will help. My practice has been to support legislation that will help the most people. If I decide that one proposed bill, let's call it bill A, will help more people than bill B, I will support bill A."

The senator embraces utilitarianism as a basis of ethical behavior. Utilitarianism, with roots in ancient hedonistic thought, was not popularized until the late 18th and early 19th centuries when Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill advocated it. Its moral or ethical principle is that proper decisions, actions, or behaviors are those that bring to the most people pleasure instead of pain. Moral values are determined as those maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain. In the field of ethics, this is referred to as the teleological position in which actions are judged good or bad by their consequences.

Utilitarianism, a popular political ethic in England and even now in the United States, served as one of the foundations for the 19th century laissez-faire government. Politicians with a populist bent often support legislation designed to make life easier for the poor.

Populist utilitarianism may have been one of the elements in President Johnson's Great Society and Roosevelt's New Deal; however, the ethics of the new liberal ideology probably provided the central motivation for the New Deal.

Populist concepts are not restricted to politicians but can be found in the thoughts and actions of many citizens. For example, an elderly lady was approached by a bedraggled man on a downtown sidewalk asking for a donation for food. Later that day the lady told her son, "I was so sorry for the poor devil—I gave him a five dollar bill."

"But, Mother, you shouldn't," lectured the son. "He will just go buy whiskey."

"I know, son, but I felt that this would give the poor fellow a few more hours of pleasure."

Utilitarians, however, developed some criteria to prevent misguided concepts of pleasure as with the lady's gift to the street beggar. Bentham's hedonistic calculus supplies tests for evaluating the pleasure over pain ratio. They include:

- Intensity—strength or weakness
- Duration—long or short existence
- Certainty—probability that pleasure will result from action
- Propinquity—nearness in time
- Fecundity—the chance that pleasure will be followed by more pleasures
- Purity—likelihood that the pleasures will be followed by greater pain
- Extent—number of persons realizing pleasure (Titus, 1954, pp. 156-57).

Obviously, the lady's generous action failed the test of true pleasure (in other words, duration, fecundity, purity). Consequently, not every sensual pleasure of the moment gains the support of utilitarians.

There is a sense of utilitarianism in the ethics of many educational administrators and parents. To many, schooling should be a happy, pleasurable experience. Many educators attempt to make schooling as pleasurable an experience as possible. This was probably one of the thrusts in the progressive education movement. As discussed previously, utilitarian ethicists strongly assert that, when examined by the consequences (the hedonistic calculus) totally self-indulgent actions are not really pleasures but gluttonous and grossly selfish behavior, the consequences of which are destructive to society and the good life.

EXISTENTIALISM

The New Left movement of the 1960s received substantial support from the philosophy of existentialism.

Soren Kierkegaard, a deeply religious Danish clergyman, is considered the father of existentialism; but, French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre is credited with popularizing it as a secular philosophy. Probably because it appealed to those rebelling against the drowning of the human spirit in materialism, technology, and the horrors of war, it was thought of as a gloomy point of view.

Actually, existentialism represents a strong reaction to the materialistic influences of naturalistic-based ethics. Its advocates insist that humankind

is the ultimate reality in a computer-equipped, technologically intensive society. Consequently, there is in existentialism a strong emotional reaction against external forces, such as bureaucracy, religion, economic systems, schools, and colleges, that dominate the spirit and limit the expression of freedom and individuality.

Any repressive institutional arrangement in society that submerges the self or encapsulates people in social, religious, or economic orthodoxy is considered bad. People should act responsibly free of external restraint in making decisions.

Rather than using scientific method, people freely make decisions concerning what is best for society and not what is best for industrial organizations, financial institutions, or organized religions. Existentialists are free to make the right decision as long as they are responsible, the decisions are free of external restraints, and they are willing to stand accountable for their decisions.

The early influence of existentialist ethics in education was an outgrowth of the popular phenomenological psychology of child growth and development and a nondirective concept of counseling. In nondirective counseling, popularized by Carl Rogers (1942), clients, not the counselors, made their own decisions. Phenomenological psychology of learning theory also advocated a permissive, nondirective role for teachers and school administrators.

For many years professors with an existentialist viewpoint taught many of the required courses for those studying to be teachers, supervisors, and administrators. As a consequence, existentialist moral values have had a pervasive influence in the field of education.

Existentialism was consistent with the counterculture, New Left, free school, open classroom, movement of the 1960s and 1970s. The "freedom works" ideas of A.S. Neil, the British Infant School movement, and a kind of new humanism swept the nation. Because individual freedom to make decisions free of repressive influences is central to existential ethics, schools must offer to students the right to make their own choices, free of external restraint. In many of the freedom schools, discipline was lax. The normless ethic of the day—do your own thing—was consistent with the self-determination curriculum and social responsiveness seminars of the 1960s and 1970s.

Other expressions of existential ethics were diversity of clothing and hair styles, vocal protests against institutions, and a change in attitudes toward traditional customs. Sloppy dress, long hair, and foul language produced a nightmare for many educational administrators. These influ-

ences and the influence of the new liberal ideology in support of the civil rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s produced significant changed in the laws governing administrative prerogatives and, consequently, administrative ethics.

OTHER MORAL PHILOSOPHIES

This discussion should not end without reference to three philosophical positions usually included in discussions of moral philosophies: situational ethics, ethical relativism, and ethical egoism.

Situation Ethics. Fletcher, a chief proponent of situation ethics, in *Situation Ethics: The New Morality* taught that living the moral life is not based on blind obedience to a legalistic interpretation of moral law but on the spirit of the loving thing to do. When moral law conflicts with the loving, caring function, people must be willing to either compromise or set aside the moral law. He used a noted case—Mrs. Bergmeier, a German citizen captured by the Russians—to illustrate his point.

After imprisonment in Russia, Mrs. Bergmeier learned that she could return to Germany and her husband and children if she were pregnant. To that end, she chose to be impregnated by a friendly Russian guard, so that she could be reunited with her family. According to Fletcher, she made the correct choice of love for family over fidelity to her husband.

In Case 18 the principal seems forced into a conflict of responsibility to care for the welfare of Ida Crossman and the responsibility or duty to provide the best possible education for the children. Doing nothing would constitute gross irresponsibility.

The message of situation ethics, then, is that each of us must face each difficult situation willing to make our decision, not in blind obedience to moral laws, but based on a genuine spirit of love. Fletcher sees love as

> The *only* principle that always obliges conscience. Unlike all other principles you might mention, love alone when well served is always good and right in every situation.

Situation ethics differs from ethical relativism because people hold on to well-established and validated moral laws. But they must be willing to make any difficult decisions in favor of the highest ethic, love, which may be in conflict with a decision prescribed by moral law.

Ethical Relativism. Ethical relativists, supported by the findings of cultural anthropologists, question the concept that one moral code is

more right than others. The great variation of morals, customs, and lifestyles among different cultures seem to a relativist to be prima facie evidence that there is not one set of natural or God-given moral rules. Consequently, there is no way to validate a single set of ethics as correct for all societies. According to ethical relativists, whatever ethic a given society chooses for a way of behavior is correct for that society and not subject to criticism by those holding conflicting values.

Many, if not most, ethicists object to ethical relativism. Those who object believe that moral truths are unrelated to cultural context. They fear that ethical relativism can lead to a kind of "do your own thing" pluralism justified primarily by personal preference, and argue that cultural pluralism does not mean that the ideal of one morality is incorrect.

Ethical Egoism. Ethical egoism was introduced previously as consistent with survival of the fittest, tooth-and-nail naturalism. Ethical egoism accepts as good all acts that promote a person's self-interest. People are morally obligated to act in their self-interest and for no other reason than for the greatest possible personal welfare and profit.

> So, if egoism is true, you are morally obligated to do whatever you can to help yourself, and I am morally obligated to do all I can to help myself. Unless it is ultimately to my benefit, I have no moral reason to perform acts that benefit you. Similarly, unless it is ultimately to your benefit, you have no moral reason to perform acts that benefit me (Feldman, 1978, p. 80).

Ayn Rand was noted for advocating selfishness as a virtue. People act in the interest of others only when it coincides with their own interests. It is not that they do not care about the welfare of others, but they are not morally obligated for altruistic behavior.

Although it is morally accepted by many, ethicists seldom embrace ethical egoism. Moreover, its tenets are inconsistent with the standards of the AASA Code of Ethics because it is inherently inconsistent with the concept of serving the public interest. Following ethical egoism may cause a public servant to be charged with conflict of interest.

CHAPTER 5

TIME FOR A NEW EMPHASIS

This is a propitious time for a new emphasis on administrative ethics in the literature and in the teaching of educational administration. The formal study of administrative ethics is essential if administrators are to cope effectively with the complex problems they face. Leaving the training of ethics to the informally handed-down process is no longer adequate.

School administrators who have an insufficient sense of right or wrong may be dangerous both to themselves and to others as well. Moreover, achieving a binding code of ethics marked by altruistic, public service overtones is essential to a truly professional status. Initiating formal preservice and inservice training programs in administrative ethics is an important step in this direction. Moreover, formal training in administrative ethics would better prepare school administrators to cope with the difficult leadership problems faced on a daily basis.

I hope this material, written for use in inservice training and preservice programs, stimulates the development of additional study material for such programs.

THE SCOPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OBLIGATIONS

Administrative ethics covers all aspects of a school administrator's work. It is not confined to flagrant criminal acts; many unethical acts are not in violation of a law. Administrative ethics includes a broad perspective of values concerning how administrators ought to conduct themselves.

A deadbeat assistant superintendent who warms a chair for 30 years and does nothing constructive for education cannot be considered ethical. Lack of action such as this violated an obligation to professional excellence.

Administrative ethics includes the broad perspective of legal obligations. Administrators are obligated to see that the law is followed, that local board policies are carried out, and that state board rules and regulations are observed. This includes also a responsibility to observe organizational rules. For members of AASA there is the obligation to live up to the AASA Code of Ethics.

In addition to these legal and professional obligations are obligations of form, as discussed in chapter two. The obligations of authority and responsibility, for example, are essential facets of any study of administra-

tive ethics. Other facets are character, the caring function, formality, loyalty, and prudence. These obligations of form include a myriad of situational behaviors impossible to list. Consequently, educational administrators must achieve deeper understanding of a source of ethics to cope with each challenge. They must learn how to decide for themselves what is right and what is wrong without attempting to rely on a cookbook of ready answers.

Therefore, the study of administrative ethics must include the realm of moral philosophy. In a very real sense administrators frequently have to be their own ethicists in determining right from wrong in nebulous situations.

TRADITIONAL SOURCES OF MORAL VALUES

Deeply woven in the sometimes frayed fabric of society are traditional sources of ethics—cynicism, hedonism, Machiavellianism, and so on—often relied on as sources of moral values. Different aspects of these traditional sources may have become our accepted standards of behavior before we attended school. We accepted them prescriptively from our families and through osmosis from our acquaintances. Also woven into the fabric of societal expectations are lingering influences of traditional systems of ethics.

IN THE REALM OF THE ETHICIST

An ethicist must not be bound by customs and traditions. Indeed, neither ethicists nor school administrators can depend on custom as the source of ethics because change is inevitable and always influences ethical practice. We have experienced within the past 40 years the beginning of an explosion of knowledge and technological development. The field of medicine has experienced sobering new problems of ethics. Education has struggled with ethical questions about substituting computerized technology for teachers. In addition, social change is already impacting on education.

School administrators, therefore, must delve into the formal processes used by ethicists to reassess their moral values. This is especially true when they experience a situation for which traditional values have no solution.

Because they face an "I don't know what to do" situation, educational administrators must engage in ethical analysis. The purpose of chapter four is to provide knowledge of moral philosophy or formal ethics as a start in this process. By understanding conflicting "schools" of ethics, ad-

ministrators can become more skillful in ethical clarification and re-examining personal perspectives on moral philosophy. Further personal growth can be achieved by engaging in group ethical clarification with colleagues. Group analysis of the cases in Appendix A could provide a basis for beginning the process.

APPENDIX A

CASES IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

CASE #1: START WITH PRAYER

Dr. Benton looked forward to fulfilling his new appointment, effective January 1, as deputy superintendent. It was his first week on the job. As was his practice, he arrived at the office rather early. On this particular morning, his wife drove him to the office; thus his assigned parking place was empty and the staff assumed he had not arrived. The door to Benton's office was left open; however, his desk was not visible from the outer-office area. Throughout the next half hour various staff members entered the office area.

Toiling through the stack of work on his desk, he became aware that William Kaufman and several colleagues were engrossed in a conversation in the conference room just out of sight of his office but not out of his hearing. Kaufman was director of a federally-funded project for organizational development with a heavy emphasis on the use of training groups. The school superintendent had emphasized that Benton should give high priority to a full analysis and evaluation of Kaufman's project. The school board had charged the superintendent to shape up the project or get rid of it. Kaufman and his colleagues were in a protracted discussion about saving the project. Joining them in the effort was an outside consultant who was paid $35,000 annually for his services on the project.

The discussion turned to how the new deputy superintendent could be influenced to keep the project and staff in place without changes that might jeopardize its continued success. "What do you know about Benton?" one of the participants asked. The discussion centered around Benton's reputation as a straitlaced churchgoer with a strong Christian orientation. Throughout the conversation the participants freely used vulgarities and profanity in discussing adversaries and potential enemies, including the discussion of how to "win Benton over." About 8:30 a.m., the secretary saw Benton in his office. She must have reported to the Kaufman group that Benton had arrived because the discussion subsided abruptly except for some muffled discussion as the group broke up.

Within a few short minutes Kaufman entered Benton's office, spoke warmly, and in an enthusiastic manner stated, "Your competence as an

outstanding administrator and your fine Christian character have preceded your arrival." Continuing in this vein he said, "All of us look forward to working for such a fine person. We have been talking about how we might improve the Organization Renewal Project and would like to talk with you about our ideas. For example, one of our ideas is that we should begin our project meetings with prayer."

"I see," responded Benton. "Would you talk a little more about the project?"

"Oh, certainly," said Kaufman, "but before we do that, may I suggest that we kneel down together here and have a word of prayer for our future together and for the success of the project."

Having heard the use of vulgarity and profanity by Kaufman and his group prior to this scheme to make use of his Christian character, Benton declined Kaufman's request and commented, "You should know, if you are not already aware, that I overheard much of what you and your group were saying in the conference room, and I am not impressed."

Questions for Discussion

1. What moral values motivated the Kaufman group in the morning meeting?
2. Should Benton have warned the group through some means (walking down the hall or coughing loudly) that their comments were audible in his office?
3. Did Benton do the right thing by telling Kaufman that he overheard the group's comments?
4. Did any of the behaviors violate the AASA Code of Ethics? If so, how?
5. Did you find other problems involving professional ethics in the case?

CASE #2: THE THIRSTY TIGER SUPPER CLUB

Ursula Bivens, 18-year veteran English teacher of Finger Lakes School District had served as president of the Finger Lakes Teachers' Association for eight years. Although some might refer to her as sharp-tongued, she was respected as a good classroom teacher. However, some of Bivens' colleagues felt she was made the scapegoat in a reduction in force. This view would be disputed, however, by Harlan Epps, former principal of Kinsington High School or KHS.

The Finger Lakes School district had experienced a sizable loss of students and was facing a reduction in force (RIF). This issue appeared to be one of the reasons for a personal rift between Bivens and Epps, which

resulted in a charge of unprofessional conduct against Epps by the Finger Lakes Teachers' Association. The charge occurred during Epps' third year as principal of KHS.

According to Bivens, Epps exhibited conduct unbecoming an administrator in several ways during and after the RIF controversy. Bivens contended that Epps had not shown her a part of her written evaluation relating to personal activities in a supper club located about six miles outside Finger Lakes. Epps' evaluation reported in a paragraph that Ursula had "badmouthed" his decisions and the decisions of the central administration "while sitting on a bar stool at the supper club." He stated in the evaluation that four other teachers had come to him separately reporting that Ursula had engaged in "backstabbing decisions that were strictly the prerogative of the administration." The evaluation notation further indicated that such activity was unprofessional and led to poor public relations. Epps contended, acknowledging her right of free speech, that Bivens' comments should have been made to him or to the school superintendent and "not in a public bar."

Epps identified three of the four persons who, as he asserted, reported that Bivens had criticized the administration. These included a plumber, a former teacher, and a former school board member. They stated, among other things, that Bivens had said that Epps was an incompetent principal and that she criticized the staff reduction process. The plumber stated that he had not actually heard the criticism but had been told by others that Bivens had made the critical statements.

Bivens said that, although she and Epps signed the evaluation report in question, she never saw the paragraph concerning her criticisms of the administration. She felt that this reprimand was in retaliation for her performance of duties as president of the teachers' association. She said that she had been critical of administrative decisions but she did have the "right of free speech;" her comments about the administration were made privately and not in a careless disregard for school public relations; and her comments in no way detracted from the quality of her teaching performance.

Another incident reported by Bivens involved a discussion at school. At about 3:30 p.m., Epps entered Bivens' classroom where she and other staff members were having a department meeting. Epps seated himself and remained silent until the meeting was over and the other teachers had left. When he and Bivens were alone, he reprimanded her for her critical statements at the supper club. This precipitated an altercation between them.

During the altercation Bivens reported that Epps was angry, and had

said to her, "You are on my ____ list," and called her an "Edith Bunker." Bivens followed Epps into the hall shouting, "What did you say? Did you call me Edith Bunker?" A school custodian who witnessed the exchange in the hall reported that Bivens exclaimed in an agitated, loud voice to Epps, "I am going to let every school board member know what you said." According to the custodian, Epps said, "Aw! Come on now." Several other teachers stated that after the episode Bivens was crying and said that Epps had told her that she was on his "____ list" and had called her an "Edith Bunker." Epps denied these statements; however, he stated that he might have said, "You are on my hit list." He denied calling her any names.

The school superintendent's followup comments are interesting. He stated that, although he supported Epps on Bivens' evaluation, he would not have used the incident at the supper club as part of an evaluation because "extra school practices, such as drinking events, are beyond the subject of staff evaluation activities." Concerning the "Edith Bunker" and "____ list" incident, the superintendent stated that he had gone into this in-depth with the parties concerned and that in his opinion the entire episode was completely frivolous.

Another aspect of the unprofessional charges brought against Epps by the Finger Lakes Teachers' Association concerned a personal conflict between Epps and Mark Hudson, a vocational education teacher and officer in the teachers' union. This apparently began with a verbal "scuffle" between the two in Hudson's classroom; whereupon, according to the charges, Epps stalked out of the room and yelled, "to hell with you—go soak your head." This was followed by a letter of reprimand from Epps to Hudson, precipitating an exchange of letters between the two. According to testimony, however, Epps and Hudson finally settled their differences with a handshake. Epps categorically denied every having made an intemperate comment to Hudson.

Questions for Discussion

1. Should the supper club incident have been entered on Bivens' record? Why or why not?

2. Is there a point in which the behavior of school personnel outside school hours interferes with their effectiveness during the school day? If so, list some conditions in which this may be true.

3. Did the behavior of Epps suggest a possible problem with the ethics of formality?

4. Did Epps fulfill the AASA Code of Ethics?

5. Did Hudson's interaction with Epps in his classroom, followed by an exchange of letters between them, indicate any ethical problems?

CASE #3: PLAINS STATE UNIVERSITY

During a recent meeting, various educators engaged in an informal discussion of administrative experiences. David Ussery recounted several experiences that occurred while he was serving as vice president for academic affairs at a university.

Ussery confessed that he did not, at the time, have ready answers for many of the episodes. He related these five incidents.

Incident 1: One day the dean of the college of arts and sciences came to my office and handed me two letters. One was from the dean of an out-of-state university. He was requesting information about a former faculty member. We had not renewed the professor's contract after three students had made informal, although declining to make formal, charges of sexual harrassment against him. According to Ussery, the professor had, after a conference with the dean and himself, been allowed to resign his position and leave without formal notice being taken. "I was comfortable with this," Ussery commented, "because I did not have the evidence to go forward with formal charges."

The second letter was to the dean of the college of arts and sciences from the former professor. He was asking for a letter of recommendation to be sent to the out-of-state college. Both the dean and Ussery were in a quandary.

Incident 2: A problem of a different sort was presented in a memo from the data center director. The memo read: "The grades given in the English department for the spring term were brought to my attention by one of the work-study students. I think you should see them." Attached to the note were grade print-outs, four of which were circled for special attention. The four faculty members teaching freshman English courses appeared to have a distinct grading pattern. Professor Lintz awarded 81 percent A and 19 percent B. Professor Moore gave 25 percent A, 50 percent B and 25 percent C. Professor Thomas gave 10 percent A, 30 percent B, and 60 percent C with a couple of D's thrown in. Professor Call awarded approximately 30 percent A, 30 percent B, 30 percent C, 10 percent D and a couple of grades of F.

"I had two problems with the memo," Ussery commented. "First, I was concerned that a work-study student was allowed to manipulate data in

the computer center and turn it in as if it had been requested. The second was the apparent problems involving ethics of grading."

Incident 3: The faculty union called my attention to a textbook requirement being established by the chairman of the economics department. According to the union official, the chairman had told other faculty members of the department that his personally authored textbook was required for all beginning economics courses.

As the union official pointed out, this would mean about 1,000 to 2,000 sales per year of the book. The situation was all the more upsetting because the professor was a highly respected, nationally recognized authority in his field.

Incident 4: A speaker representing South Africa had been invited to the campus by the student government as part of their speaker/lecture series. Several student groups, in planned unison, heckled the speaker until he could not be heard, and the program was finally cancelled. This was not the end of this type of incident though. The president of the student body learned that another group of students was determined to interrupt in similar fashion the speech to be made two weeks hence by the president of the NAACP.

Incident 5: The head of the school nursing program came in with one of her senior students. The student was raising a sensitive issue, and we needed to deal with it. The student stated that she, along with other students, were upset about abortion instruction they were receiving in the classroom. In addition, in their practice situations they were responsible for assisting in distributing information about abortion and for dispensing medication that might terminate pregnancy. The student asserted that for some of them, abortion was contrary to their religious beliefs and that the content should not be included in the academic or practicum aspects of the program.

Questions for Discussion

Analyze each incident discussed by Ussery to identify answers to the following questions.

1. What moral problems were presented in each episode?
2. In each episode, what actions were open to Ussery?
3. Taking each episode separately, what action would be most defensible from the standpoint of basic and professional ethics?

CASE #4: IS PLAYING POLITICS ETHICAL?

Norton Ainsley, the new superintendent for Sears City Schools—a resort district with some industrial base of approximately 45,000 students—hired two new assistant superintendents. Katherine Beach, an administrator with a great deal of experience in urban school systems, was employed as assistant superintendent for instruction, and Roger Conway, who had a solid reputation in using systems approaches to school administration, was employed as assistant superintendent for business.

During his interviews with the two, Ainsley stated that he wished to move the school district toward a systems approach with an emphasis on modern management. He also indicated that the school board was concerned that the district had not made more progress in this direction because the legislature had passed a law mandating the changes.

Once they were on the job, Beach and Conway were part of the central staff meetings in which Ainsley continued to stress his ideas for the development of the district and repeated his intent to move toward a systems approach. He clearly emphasized that Beach and Conway were to work together closely to achieve this goal.

With these directives Beach and Conway spent long hours and days of planning and establishing the necessary procedures to attain Ainsley's objectives, including the development of the required budgeting processes.

As they settled into the district though, Beach and Conway perceived that the district and town seemed to be a tightly knit "family" group and might resent such changes coming from "outsiders" such as they. Both were aware enough of this sort of problem to realize that the group's reaction could be to turn on them and possibly the superintendent. When Beach and Conway expressed their concerns to Ainsley in their next meeting, he strongly reassured them that not only was the board fully behind the changes, but the law also required their implementation. When Beach continued to pick up evidence of opposition and discontent, she and Conway expressed concern and were reassured by the superintendent that he would handle any of that, "they should just get the job done." He also reaffirmed his support at every meeting.

With oral and written approval of their plan for reform, Beach and Conway began to implement the program. To establish and process individual school budgets, they set up teacher budget cards and computerized programs. The principals were given inservice training in school-based management in preparation for full implementation during the next school year.

Beach began to pick up inklings that the teachers' association was resis-

tant to the program. Some school principals had also expressed strong dissatisfaction.

Conway also observed that Sears City was a school district with a "sweetheart" type of association. In other words, Sears City had been allowed to continue a professional association with both teachers and administrators as members. Teacher negotiations under a sweetheart arrangement really amount to a constancy of agreement. For example, if teachers agree to a 12 1/2 percent salary increase, administrators receive the same. Beach had opposed this sort of an automatic increase because it took money away from instructional needs.

She was also increasingly aware of informal communication links that had developed between two supervisors, the school board chairman, and the president of the teachers' association. Before changes suggested in a staff meeting were decided and announced, the chairman of the board would bring them up at the next board meeting. Also the president of the teachers' association was apparently feeding comments about Beach to a local reporter. The comments were of a personal nature implying that Beach was inaccessible to teachers and other staff members.

Not long after these revelations, Ainsley instructed Beach to meet with some federal grant officials rather than attend a scheduled board meeting. He felt that Beach's experience obtaining federal grants made her presence at that meeting a higher priority than attending the board meeting.

In the middle of Beach's meeting, one of her assistants interrupted to announce that Beach and Conway had been fired at the board meeting. Apparently, the superintendent had put all the administrators up for reappointment, and a board member had moved that all be approved except Beach and Conway. The motion was passed.

Beach immediately contacted Superintendent Ainsley, who stated he was just as upset as she and that he had no forewarning. Both Beach and Conway were troubled that the board fired them without giving cause even though, according to Ainsley, the board attorney had warned the school board that cause had to be given for the action.

When Beach and Conway attempted to talk to others after the board meeting, most were close mouthed about the situation. On their recommendation Superintendent Ainsley called a person in the department of education with experience in this sort of thing. The official advised Ainsley to take a stand against the board because its actions were illegal. He advised Ainsley that the board had to act on his recommendation and if they did not accept the recommendation, they were required to show

cause. Ainsley told Beach and Conway that he could not follow the official's advice because he served as the board secretary. Beach and Conway, faced with the end of the school year and no jobs, felt they had no alternative but to sue.

In gathering information for their suit, Beach and Conway learned of questionable actions that had perhaps affected the situation. A former president of the teachers' association had been appointed recently to the board. In addition, some of the other board members were closely involved with the teachers' association. Also, a board member had alerted a staff secretary that at the upcoming meeting there was going to be a big "shakeup."

In the meantime, Ainsley began to deny that he had wanted them to push the new plan so hard. He also was reluctant to give the audiotapes of the board meeting to Beach and Conway. Of course, on the tapes the board attorney could be heard clearly advising the board that if they did not accept their superintendent's recommendations, they were required to show cause.

Other incidents that came to light were:

- One of Beach's assistants had apparently been keeping the chairman of the board posted on all activities in Beach's office—for what may have been self-serving reasons.
- Three board members and officials of the teachers' association had participated in a clandestine meeting three days before the board meeting.

Some of this information was provided by Jane Mills, vice president of the teachers' association, who felt very uncomfortable with what had transpired and had approached Beach and Conway's attorney.

Several special meetings were held between the board and the attorney representing Beach and Conway. The board still refused to give a hearing or a cause for not accepting the superintendent's recommendation. Superintendent Ainsley also refused to say why he would not recommend them again. Eventually, after many delays for various reasons, Beach and Conway accepted a settlement. As part of the settlement, the board signed a statement that there was no cause for dismissal and that they were competent administrators. Beach and Conway were also employed for one more year as consultants by the district.

Questions for Discussion

1. Was anyone in this case in violation of the AASA Code of Ethics (see specifically Standards 4 and 7)? Does the behavior of any of the par-

ticipants indicate that they were influenced by Machiavellianism?

2. What should have been the superintendent's principles of behavior in maintaining personal power and authority?

3. How would you judge the character of the main participants?

4. Did the participants exercise responsibility in ensuring that justice was done? Did the board of education exercise justice?

5. Were questions of administrative loyalty involved in this case?

6. Do you question the brand of politics played in the case? Does this mean that all forms of political leadership are unethical?

CASE #5: CARING AND RESPONSIBILITY IN SPRINGBROOK

Springbrook, a small conservative resort community, was noted for its hospitality, but some newcomers to Springbrook, employees at the new Battery Plant, were not impressed with what they considered its below par schools. A controversy concerning the schools had arisen, and L.E. Mizell, superintendent for 15 years, was at the center of the debate.

Those who were unhappy were finding it difficult to "buck the system," too. A relatively small number of businessmen, politicians, and physicians seemed to be running what was a relatively conservative approach toward all government services, including education.

Superintendent Mizell was a product of Springbrook's educational system. A local "boy" and former all-conference football player, he had returned to Springbrook, after an undistinguished academic performance at the university, to teach and coach football.

Some interesting stories circulated about Mizell's administration; for example, during one of his principals' meetings, he spent a great deal of the time reading the newspaper. During a planning session on bond issues, he fell asleep.

Characterized by the central office staff as a "political animal," Mizell seemed concerned primarily with his personal survival. With his questionable devotion to education and the tight-fisted policies of the political leaders, the Springbrook district was in poor financial shape.

During the twelfth year of Mizell's tenure as superintendent, the regional accrediting agency formally expressed grave concern to the Springbrook board of education about the lack of instructional supplies and equipment, low salaries, and generally deficient funding of the program. Mizell's reaction was defensive, and the majority of the board members felt enough money was being spent and the quality of education was fine.

Nevertheless, during Mizell's last two years as superintendent, the op-

position to his leadership had increased into a viable political force for change in the composition of the school board and in the professional leadership of the system.

The opposition leaders appealed directly to the chief state school officer (CSSO) for assistance in improving the quality of leadership in the Springbrook school system. In the words of one of these leaders, "Mr. Mizell is oblivious to the educational problems of Springbrook—fiddles while Rome burns." Unfortunately, Holstrom, the CSSO, felt he could not intervene. He said that education was a local responsibility and that the state department could not become involved in local politics. In a private conversation with a Springbrook leader, the director of educational finance for the state, off the record, commented that, while the Springbrook school budget met basic regulations, "I hold my nose every year and approve it."

Questions for Discussion

1. One concern about ethical behavior in this case involves the matter of responsibility. In the brief description of Mizell's administration, did he exercise proper professional responsibility? Authority?
2. Would Mizell be described better as an uncaring person or as one who does not care for the right things?
3. Did the CSSO exercise responsibility in this case? What is the ethical responsibility of the CSSO with reference to leadership with the LEAs?
4. We discussed the concept of "commitment to professional excellence" earlier. In what ways does this case illustrate an allegiance to or lack of allegiance to high principles of professional excellence?
5. Did Mizell observe the AASA Code of Ethics (see especially Standards 1, 7, and 9)?
6. Considering the moral philosophies discussed previously, was Mizell influenced more toward Machiavellianism than idealism?

CASE #6: SUSPENSION OF THE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

In Rodney Keen's mind the actions taken against his daughter, Robyn Keen, were completely uncalled for and, as he expressed himself, "a throw-back to the stone age." Along with five other high school youths, Robyn had been suspended for three days by Wallace Race, principal of Everson High School, for alleged use of alcohol and drugs and for smoking. Encouraged by friends, Keen decided with Robyn's concurrence to bring charges of unethical conduct against Race. The feeling was that Race acted arbitrarily on inherently untrustworthy information, and he

disregarded due process.

The incident precipitating the suspension of the six students occurred during a band trip on a school bus to a nearby school district. The suspension letters prepared stated that Robyn Keen and five other students were observed "by staff, chaperones, and students on the bus participating in the use of drugs, alcohol, and smoking and other behavior unbecoming an Everson High School student."

According to testimony before the state Professional Practices Commission, at one point during the bus trip a student, David Echols, stood up and in a loud voice accused some of the students of using drugs and alcohol and referred to them as "dopeheads" and "potheads" (the student was the son of an influential banker). Before the bus trip home the driver exclaimed to the students, "You are acting like a bunch of zombies!" There was no further explanation in testimony before the commission concerning what he meant. Neither the chaperone nor the bus driver reported anything untoward concerning the trip to the principal.

The chaperone and the bus driver did not testify at the commission hearing. Nevertheless, at the hearing, evidence was presented that the chaperone, on the day after the trip, provided some kind of a student list to Grace Davidson, the superintendent. However, the information was apparently obtained from an unnamed student.

The morning after the band trip, David Echols, the student who had spoken out on the bus initiated a conference with Race. Echols told him about seeing the drinking of alcohol, smoking of pot, and swallowing of pills on the bus and provided a list of involved students.

The conference was interrupted by a male teacher who offered to obtain more information about the incident from students in his class, then in progress. The teacher left and within a few minutes returned with a list of students who were accused of wrongdoing; however, there was no indication concerning whether those giving the information were on the bus, nor were the names of those reporting the information provided. The teacher did not indicate on his lists the specific acts (e.g., drinking brandy, smoking pot, sniffing a yellow substance) engaged in by the accused. Race testified at the commission hearing that he made no contact with those individuals who supplied the student lists, that he made no effort to interrogate the suspended students, and that he was unaware of the condition or process used by the classroom teacher to obtain the list.

Following the conference, Race consulted with the superintendent. There were two decision-making meetings and numerous phone conversations between the two. The superintendent, visibly upset, stated that

she was experiencing strong pressure to act, and felt disciplinary action was in order. She mentioned that some prominent town leaders were upset. The next day Race decided to place the students on a three-day suspension with the superintendent's concurrence.

At approximately 1:30 p.m., Race notified the parents by telephone of the formal suspension. He then called the six students and two observers into his office and handed the students their suspension notices. These notices indicated that they were being suspended for participating in the use and/or possession of alcohol, drugs, and smoking. According to Race (supported by the observers), Robyn Keen became enraged, wadded up the suspension notice, and threw it on the desk and used foul language. Two other students were also upset and expressed their objections forcefully. Race walked over, opened the office door, and announced that there would be no further discussion until Tuesday. Two of the students, who had remained calm throughout, stayed behind and requested further discussion but were refused. Race's comment was "see me Tuesday."

The school was immediately threatened with a lawsuit by Robyn Keen's parents, which complicated further communication. As part of the aftermath, Race was brought before the state Professional Practices Commission.

Robyn testified before the state Professional Practices Commission that on the bus trip in question, "I did not use, nor did I see anyone else in possession of or using alcohol, drugs, or tobacco." She said that she and Echols were on unfriendly terms. She stated that the principal had no independent evidence against her and had acted capriciously on unsupported statements. Concerning the "sniffing" incident, Robyn testified that the caffein in No-Doze tablets upset her stomach and that she had reduced the tablets to powder and sniffed them into her nostrils. She contended that the suspension notices for all six students were uniform and did not specify in each student's case the nature of wrongdoing with which each was charged. Race agreed that he had treated all students collectively, not individually, but contended that "this process of handling such problems is administratively expedient."

Questions for Discussion

1. Did a violation of the AASA Code of Ethics occur in this case (see Code Standards 1, 3, and 4)?

2. How would you evaluate the exercise of prudence on the part of the principal, the superintendent, and the chaperones? Was there evidence of

the caring function?

3. Was the treatment of the students in the office an acceptable use of authority?

4. Did the exercise of political pressure interfere with the sense of justice?

CASE #7: CORRUPTION BY ACCIDENT

Sam Bradshaw, an up-and-coming administrator, was principal of a large high school. A successful teacher, he was well-liked by his faculty and by key members of the central office staff. He expected shortly to begin residence at the university for his doctorate.

Bradshaw was close to Superintendent Creighton; both of them were thought to have great professional futures. Creighton and Bradshaw socialized together and frequently enjoyed weekends at Creighton's vacation place. Creighton and Bradshaw were known occasionally to "hoist a few too many" at the vacation spot, but since they never bothered anyone, no one objected.

Bradshaw's school had a complete vocational education department that received great support from Superintendent Creighton as a means to help upward mobility of the disadvantaged and minorities.

One day, Creighton commented to Bradshaw about the expense of outfitting his new deep sea fishing boat. They got into a deep discussion of what was desired and how such things as sonar equipment were grossly overpriced on the market.

Bradshaw discussed various possibilities of reducing the cost of the items, but none of his suggestions seemed to meet Creighton's needs. As a friend, Bradshaw suggested to Creighton that he thought he could figure out a way to buy some of the equipment using one of the accounts to which local businesses contributed money each year. Creighton and Bradshaw congratulated themselves on having found the perfect solution for the difficulties. Creighton would get what he wanted, Bradshaw would be able to help him, and no one would be hurt. After all, this was not tax money, and the businessmen would not mind.

Bradshaw obtained approval for the equipment and purchased it through the department of vocational education.

The clerk who maintained the accounts for the school did, as was her procedure, question Mr. Young, the head of vocational education, about the purchase of sonar equipment. Young never provided an explanation. The next time the clerk asked Young about a subsequent voucher, she was politely told to forget the matter. Worried, she went to Bradshaw.

He politely suggested that this was for a newly funded project in the department involving sea-going craft.

Bothered by the succession of strange items, the clerk started doing some detective work. Her friend, secretary to the director of vocational education, said there were standard instructions to call Bradshaw when orders on the account were filled. Bradshaw would then come down and pick up the items. The trail ended there.

No one is quite certain who "blew the whistle" on Bradshaw and Creighton. All of a sudden, though, the auditors began going over the books. The newspapers publicized the story widely. Following two board meetings at which angry words were expressed, Bradshaw and Creighton were fired and, of course, faced more consequences in the courts.

Questions for Discussion

The professional careers of some educational administrators have been ruined as the result of a drift into criminal activity. The intentions may be to defraud from the beginning. On the other hand, embezzlement, which is sometimes referred to as the most honest of crimes, often begins with honest intentions of restoring the "borrowed money."

1. List some fairly simple, straightforward safeguard practices to observe to prevent a drift into fraudulent activities.
2. What are specific legal requirements for which administrators are responsible in handling school funds?
3. What does the AASA Code of Ethics state with reference to the behavior of Bradshaw and Creighton?
4. Discuss some cases involving the fraudulent mismanagement of public funds. What appeared to be the temptations in these cases for the misbehavior of the administrators?
5. Returning to a consideration of traditional and philosophical bases of ethics, discussed in chapters 3 and 4, is embezzlement ever supported by moral philosophy?

CASE #8: THE RAMON RODRIGUEZ CASE

Because Ramon Rodriguez had attended the downtown high school in Valley City, he thought that he really knew the city. That was why he gladly accepted the position as principal of the downtown Elmdale Elementary School when it was offered. It was good to be back in the old neighborhood with friends and family. However after an encounter with Millicent Brandywine, the new third grade teacher, he felt the teachers were all lining up against him and were after his scalp. A move was afoot

to have his credentials revoked. He could not understand the reason for Brandywine's anger unless she was trying to get even for a less than enthusiastic evaluation that he had given her the year before.

He had told her that her room seemed sterile with the kids all in their seats and so quiet. In his words, "Children that age should be learning to interact with each other, learning to develop relationships that would last all through their lives." Ramon thought to himself that she should not be so serious about whether third graders could do long division or not. There would be plenty of time for that later. He told her that she should loosen up and live a little herself. Realizing that she was new in town, Rodriguez told her that if she came down to the Yellow Rose Cafe, he and his wife would introduce her around. She had seemed a little miffed and never did come visit the cafe. This had all seemed innocent enough to Ramon. Nevertheless, Brandywine avoided him in school, and did not speak to him again until the last day before winter vacation.

On the last day before vacation, Rodriguez was at the far end of the building when the children were dismissed. On the way back to the main office he met Tom Smith, the fifth grade teacher. Putting his arm around Smith's shoulder, he wished him a safe drive home to visit his parents.

Cressida Owen, the librarian, was locking her door as they passed, and Ramon gave her a big hug, a pinch, and a wink, and told her that she had better watch out for the new year. She laughed and told him that he had better watch out himself. In Rodriguez's opinion, she would make someone a fine wife. She had character.

About that time Gwynne Starke and Herman Cassidy came along. They all walked back toward the office together. As Rodriguez turned to go in, he shook Herman's hand, and when Gwynne offered hers, he kissed it. He knew that she really did not like it, but it might put a little color in her cheeks. It was obvious that it worked.

Then the third grade teachers, Margaret Rome and Millicent Brandywine, came down the hall singing a carol that their students had learned. Rodriguez joined in the chorus, wished them a Merry Christmas, and gave them each a hug and a kiss. After Rodriguez released her, Brandywine went into a tirade about how that was "the last time" that he was going to harass her! She then stated, "I'm going to put a stop to it!"

Rodriguez, sorry that he had startled her, was sure she would cool off. He was mistaken. The following week he received a call from the superintendent informing him of a formal investigation to examine charges that he had been harassing female teachers. A letter would follow with the charges. He tried to explain what had happened to the superinten-

dent, but was told the proper forum would be when they all met with the school board the following Tuesday. The superintendent advised Ramon that it would be in his best interest to come to the meeting with legal counsel.

At the ensuing board meeting, teacher after teacher testified to "improper" actions on the part of Rodriguez. Most had not complained before because they considered the action to be an isolated incident and not worth making a scene over. One teacher did testify to his kissing and hugging her in his office with the door closed. Another related that he had offered to pay her expenses to accompany him to a professional meeting. They all expressed agreement that the time had come to stop it and were thankful for Brandywine's actions.

When the opportunity came for Ramon's defense, his attorney called several teachers and office personnel who testified that they had not been victimized by Rodriguez. They thought he was a fine administrator who had gone out of his way to try to develop a congenial atmosphere. Further, they believed that the first group was after him because of differences in educational philosophy.

Unfortunately for Rodriguez, the Brandywine faction was vociferous and numerous. The board voted five to two to relieve him of his position and to recommend to the state professional ethics commission that his certification be revoked.

Questions for Discussion

This case raises some very important questions concerning the way administrators relate to subordinates. One may question whether Ramon Rodriguez was guilty of sexual harassment or whether he placed himself in enough compromising situations to be vulnerable to attack.

1. Was Rodriguez guilty of unethical behavior? Why?
2. Is there a possibility that he was victimized by an opposing teacher clique? If so, did he contribute to his own demise through behavior that could be questioned on ethical grounds?
3. What are the most basic principles to follow in working with subordinates of the opposite sex?
4. Did the ethics of formality contribute to Ramon's problem or was his problem a result of imprudent behavior?

CASE #9: ONE THING LEADS TO ANOTHER

One thing that John Ledford, principal of Milford High School, emphasized was development of good staff morale. He worked hard at developing a

good climate for teaching and learning. In the past he dabbled in the T-group technique and other organizational development methods. As part of his leadership role, John favored faculty social activities, including small group luncheons and drinks at a local tavern after school. Marsha Mills, one of the assistant principals, proved especially helpful in these activities and was, as John often put it, "a good mixer." In fact, over the first three years after she took her position, Marsha slipped into what faculty members described as "John's alter ego." The two found themselves spending more time together planning staff development activities.

One thing led to another and what was a friendship became an affair. Rumors circulated and they both began to experience marital problems.

Gossip about the affair finally reached Superintendent Arbuckle whose initial attitude was that as long as private lives did not affect professional performance, it was none of his business. However, after visits from concerned parents, an irate minister of a fundamentalist church, and upset faculty members, Arbuckle called Ledford into his office.

In a dramatic confrontation, Arbuckle informed Ledford that he was reassigning both of them. Ledford was placed in a staff position far removed from public attention and interaction with faculty members. Mills, who had already met with Arbuckle, was given a leave of absence for a year, with the promise of a teacher position upon her return.

Questions for Discussion

Her study of organizational outcomes of social relations led Swain (1983) to conclude that dating or more involved relationships of an administrator with another member of the organization were always detrimental to work relationships. In each case studied, these activities "were associated with alienation of others, perceptions of favoritism, loss of respect, negative staff alliance, and divisiveness" (p. 82).

1. What should be an administrator's "ethical policy" in interacting with persons of the opposite sex?
2. How does an administrator avoid providing a basis for rumors of "compromising situations" in relationships with members of the faculty?
3. Should Arbuckle have taken action much earlier in the affair? Was the action he took consistent with ideal ethical values?
4. Should school boards adopt any policies with reference to dating and sexual behavior?
5. In *Situation Ethics: The New Morality*, Fletcher suggests that in some situations (for example, the Mrs. Bergmeier case, in chapter four) there may be exceptions to some moral rules. Do you agree or disagree with

the idea that there may be exceptions to moral laws?

CASE #10: GROSS IMMORALITY AND MORAL TURPITUDE

Cora Jones was the sole support for herself and her son Billy, who was a special education student. Because she did not have enough training, the only job available to her was as night custodian at the local middle school.

The principal, H. Rountree, allowed her to bring Billy to work with her. While she was cleaning, Billy was allowed to shoot baskets in the gymnasium.

Eventually, the principal began to join Billy in the gym to shoot baskets. Afterwards, they would straighten up the gym, take showers, and Billy would join his mother in the cafeteria for a sandwich.

When Billy's arrival to the cafeteria became later and later, his mother began to question him about his tardiness. Billy told her that they were trying to save water by taking showers together and it took longer. Suspicious, she checked up on what was happening and caught the principal molesting Billy.

Immediately, she called the chairman of the school board and the superintendent. The superintendent, S. Malvern, confronted the principal, Rountree, who admitted his guilt. He resigned and left town without contesting the matter.

Malvern commented that he was interested in solving the matter with the least amount of publicity. He considered it solved because they had appointed a fine principal to the school and there hadn't been any unpleasant publicity. As far as he was concerned, that was the end of the case.

Questions for Discussion

1. Did the superintendent have any professional responsibility beyond seeing that Rountree was removed from office? Should he have initiated action to have Rountree's certification revoked by the state?

2. As was true in this case, many states have no well-developed procedures to hear cases involving possible violations of administrative ethics. Should Sidney Malvern and his fellow superintendents seek legislation to establish a state ethics committee or commission to hear such cases?

CASE #11: SUPER CITY: A CASE OF LOYALTY

Wayne Tompkins still had a sad feeling when he thought about the Peter

Drew incident many years later. Superintendent Tompkins had actually served as Drew's professional mentor during his climb through the professional ranks. He moved him rapidly through the ranks and eventually appointed him deputy superintendent. Tompkins fully anticipated recommending Drew for the position of superintendent when he retired after renewing one more three-year contract.

It appeared that Drew did not have the patience to wait though. Tompkins began to get feedback from staff and board members that Drew was questioning Tompkins' policies and abilities to various principals and making critical statements to some of the community leaders. In addition, he was cozying up to these same people, making promises of changes and appointments when he became superintendent.

Finally, Tompkins confronted Drew with what he was hearing. He told Drew that if he wanted the job that much, he would recommend to the board that they open up the competition when his contract was up.

Apparently, the confrontation did little to slow Drew down. He began to feed sensitive, confidential information to the media that could be harmful to the school system and the superintendent. To find out for sure if Drew was really doing this, Tompkins fed some information to him alone. Sure enough, it appeared in the papers the next day.

The next morning Superintendent Tompkins called Pete Drew into his office, confronted him with numerous reports of his acts of disloyalty, and fired him.

There was a stir of opposition to Tompkins' action. Most deplored the removal of so valuable a person just because he was opposed to, what one letter expressed, "the antiquated administration of Tompkins." The executive secretary of the teachers' association questioned the "hasty, ill-advised action of an administration with a history of paternalism," and Tompkins received numerous phone calls inquiring about the matter. A 4-3 vote of the board upheld Tomkins' decision.

Drew wrote a long letter to the editor explaining his side of the incident. According to Drew, he was crucified because he attempted to unveil what had been going on in the schools. He demanded a state ethics commission investigation.

The weight of opinion in Super City, however, favored Superintendent Tompkins. Moreover, his colleagues, the superintendents of other school systems, felt that Peter Drew, as one expressed it, "got what was coming to him."

Questions for Discussion

1. Among other things, this case raises important questions about administrative loyalty. In examining the case, do you find a basis for disloyalty in Peter Drew?

2. Another ethical problem in this case is the question of runaway ambition or personal opportunism. Was Drew too driven by his own personal goals? Did Tompkins and Drew live up to the AASA Code of Ethics?

3. How is administrative loyalty promoted in a school organization?

4. One problem in the demand for loyalty is the creation of "yes men" or "yes women." This in itself brings forth ethical questions. What is the proper balance of loyalty?

5. Some might describe Tompkins' rapid promotion of Drew as cronyism. How would you evaluate it? What constitutes the act of cronyism? Does cronyism constitute a conflict of interest?

CASE #12: ALL BUT THE DISSERTATION

Joel Ayres was a successful, busy principal who had gained a solid reputation in using computers in high school administration. He developed and headed a management information system for his school district and began teaching courses at the local university, where he was encouraged to begin work on his doctorate.

When he had completed all the work for his doctorate except his dissertation, he was just too impatient and wanted to get back into the schools. Against the advice of his advisor, he accepted a job as assistant superintendent in a district quite a distance from the university.

The first time he was introduced to the board of education and members of the press in his new school district, Superintendent Cumbo referred to Ayres as "Dr. Ayres." Rather than embarrass him, Ayres resolved to correct the matter later.

When he talked to Cumbo about the title, Cumbo's reaction was for Ayres not to worry, he would finish the dissertation soon, so what was the difference?

Three years later, "Dr." Ayres had not finished his dissertation, but he was doing an excellent job. When Cumbo retired on disability, Ayres was appointed acting superintendent. Not long after, someone "blew the whistle" on Ayres, and the newspapers picked up on it. Some principals who resented his management system and a disgruntled board member fanned the flames.

Ayres was crushed. He tried to explain the situation, but everything he said seemed to be awkward. His adversaries closed in. Two days later he

tendered his resignation to the board of education and moved from the district.

Questions for Discussion

1. Was Joel Ayres guilty of unethical conduct, or was he the victim of a situation?
2. Did Superintendent Cumbo contribute to Joel's problem? Did he exercise prudence?
3. Did Joel Ayres and Superintendent Cumbo behave in harmony with the AASA Code of Ethics?
4. Was the "whistle-blowing" activity in the case justified?

CASE #13: The Jovial Principal

Robert "Pops" Gianelli, the affable principal of Walton High School, arrived at school on Monday in good spirits. The day went well except for a little incident in the lunchroom with the Gonzalez boy. Tony Gonzalez had seemed to be somewhat reserved ever since his parents had complained to Gianelli last year that Tony should have his schedule changed. "Pops" had gone out of his way to try to get closer to Tony through friendly, jocular remarks. He had found that students responded positively to his "get close" manner of identifying with them. Typical of his approach was an incident that happened on the Friday before when he diffused successfully a potentially volatile difference between two students, Norman Manora and Vincent Neccio, by asserting, "Oh! Come on now, why don't you Wops settle this thing sensibly, and I don't want to hear any more about it." Coming from "Pops," the students could only laugh and walk away.

Late Monday afternoon, however, Gianelli received a phone call from Tony Gonzalez' mother protesting that he owed them an apology for making demeaning and derogatory remarks to Tony in the lunchroom. Gianelli apologized to her and was willing to apologize to Tony.

Gianelli, who thought that he had allayed her anger, was surprised when Mrs. Gonzalez brought a complaint before the board of education and later before the state professional practices committee.

According to the complaint statement made by Ruth and Mario Gonzalez, "Robert Gianelli did on or about 12:15 p.m. on Monday, October 5, make derogatory remarks personally offensive and painful to our son, Tony Gonzalez." The complaint further stated that on that date Tony and a friend were sitting together in the school lunchroom. They were approached by the principal, Robert Gianelli, and the assistant principal;

whereupon Gianelli stated in a rather stern, loud voice to Tony, "No spics can sit together at lunch today." According to the complaint, such terms as "spic" and "wop" are ethnically demeaning, offensive, and professionally improper.

In his testimony before the board of education and professional practices committee, Gianelli explained that Tony was, on the day in question, sitting with another student who had been involved with him in past discipline problems. They had been told not to sit together for a while. Gianelli stated that Tony was wearing a knit shirt that had "Super Spic" across the back, and he was trying to make his point in a jocular way. He intended no ethnic slurs. Further, he likened his use of such terms with students to the way "gringo" was not offensive to non-Hispanic people. Other people supported Gianelli's statement and testified that he was not ethnically or racially prejudiced.

Questions for Discussion

The principals of many city high schools have student bodies made up of youth from a number of racial and ethnic groups. This case involves the question of the principal's style of leadership or "bedside manner" in dealing with clients. The case also involves the age-old question of how familiar the administrator should become with students.

1. Was Gianelli's "familiar pop" style prudent? Would the ideal professional-client relationship in educational administration include his approach?

2. As you reflect on the professional "culture" or set of professional norms most widely accepted in the field of educational administration, did Gianelli operate in consistency with this culture?

3. Should the administrator ever use such terms as "spic," "wop," or similar terms even though used in jest?

CASE # 14: THE FLIPPANT ATTENDANCE MEMORANDUM

While serving as principal of Arcadia Middle School, Stuart Odom routinely circulated an attendance faculty memorandum listing students absent from school and the reason for their absence. In some instances, Odom would slip in a personal comment, such as

- "Loretta Masterson...14 times...counselor appointment (out-of-town counselor...extenuating in that she probably needs this counseling)."
- "Anna Belle Everson...12 times...married...upset stomach (something she ate). Obviously she has problems which are not school-related—I

don't think...."

• "Gerald Foresythe...15 times...just is not cut out for school, I guess. On the other hand, let us keep him in school for whatever good it will do."

Eventually, however, copies of the memorandum got into the hands of students and parents. Irate parents flooded the school with calls; and Odom was called into conference by the superintendent and deputy superintendent.

The superintendent was concerned not with how students got the memorandum but whether Odom's "flippant personal comments" were necessary in the first place.

While Odom insisted that he meant no harm by his comments, the superintendent stressed the importance of protecting sensitive information about students. As a result, Odom prepared and distributed a public apology.

Questions for Discussion

The primary focus of this case is a matter of prudence or ethics of common sense, since nothing suggests that Odom wrote the memorandum with intent to injure students.

1. Did Odom exercise foresight and precaution in attaching flippant remarks to the circulated memorandum?
2. What are some everyday precautions the administrator should observe to ensure prudence?
3. How can we ensure that we are appointing persons to administrative positions who exemplify prudence or common sense?

CASE #15: THE REVOLVING DOOR

Harry Wolfe, an electrical technology faculty member at Central City Community College, had moved to CCCC from a software firm. He made the move because he felt the company was missing the boat by not developing certain materials for computer-assisted instruction.

Under Harry's guidance at CCCC, a Computer-Assisted Instruction Committee developed and arranged funding for a project using the microcomputer to supplement instruction in several beginning laboratory classes. Computer-expert Mary Lee from Central City High School along with two of her colleagues, was included on the committee to develop high school-level materials.

Once tested, the programs proved successful. Harry and Mary published journal articles and the programs received much interest. Job offers for

the two followed, and Harry and Mary eventually joined Future Instructional Technologies Ltd. to head a new division to produce a new generation of high school and college course software.

Using the original project as base, Harry and his co-workers designed a second generation of software that was more adaptable and easier to use than the first. With the company's approval, he and Mary distributed the second generation materials to their former committee members who had stayed on at the college and high school. These people received consultant fees for their help in developing the programs.

In time, the programs proved to be popular, and sales were swift.

Questions for Discussion

Perhaps the most serious ethical issue in this case involved the so-called "revolving door" syndrome made popular in Washington, where corporation leaders move in and out of government. This has been of special concern in the case of defense contracts.

1. Is it a conflict of interest to revise material developed under a government grant and then sell it on the open market?
2. Should profits from marketing the software have gone to the committee, to the schools, or to Mary and Harry? What would be the controlling factor?
3. What ethical rules should guide the conduct of professional educators in this case and others?

CASE #16: THE KENNETH SAMPLES CASE

Kenneth Samples was director of a U.S. Department of Labor division that administered a program of nearly a billion dollars. Funds for this program did not flow to states but were allocated directly to the several thousand qualifying Service Delivery Areas (SDAs).

When Samples first assumed his position, his responsibility was to administer the program consistently within the intent of Congress and in accordance with published regulations. If a SDA qualified for funds, a set formula determined the support to be provided.

Samples handled a complaint shortly after he took office involving the Everson Air Force Base in North State, where base personnel were concerned about funding for schools in the Everson school system. The base commandant, General Ashmore, had his top official contact the Department of Labor to talk about increasing the funds. Samples firmly stated the rules and considered the matter closed. However, the general was not satisfied with the answer he got and brought in a friend who was a state

senator to intervene in the matter. After receiving pressure from the senator and others connected with the system—including the superintendent and chairman of the Everson Board of Education—Samples gave in. He cited a provision in the General Administrative Provisions Act, although it was clearly inapplicable, and agreed to increase funds for the district.

Such manipulation of the rules became a common practice for Samples during his eight-year tenure as a division head.

However, complaints from school systems not receiving benefits of these extra funds started coming in. Eventually, this triggered an audit that revealed the illegal practices. Sample was officially removed from his position and assigned to another division.

Questions for Discussion

This case demonstrates how subordinates are sometimes placed under political pressures by superiors and others. All educational administrators find themselves in this difficult situation from time to time.

1. Did the actions of those pressuring Kenneth Samples constitute an abuse of power and authority? By pressuring Samples, did his superiors violate Standard 4 of the AASA Code of Ethics?
2. Was it appropriate for the general and his senator to bring pressure on Samples?
3. What alternatives did Kenneth Samples have when the pressure became almost unbearable? Did he accept the only alternative?
4. Do you find any philosophically based justification for Kenneth Samples' decision not to follow the law?

CASE #17: THE TOUGH-MINDED SUPERINTENDENT

When Harry Cline was made superintendent of the Freeport City Schools, the board of education made it clear to him that they wanted a tough-minded disciplinarian who could straighten out some serious problems in the district.

However, angry outbursts by Cline at an October staff meeting ignited an altercation between him and the staff, resulting in the mass resignation of 15 teachers the following April.

That July, an interested parent brought a complaint—consisting of 38 charges of unprofessional conduct—against Cline. Before the commission hearing, 12 complaints were withdrawn, and the commission excluded 11 others as being outside its jurisdiction. In addition to the October meeting, other incidents of angry outbursts and unprofessional behavior

on Cline's part were cited during testimony. These incidents involved teachers and other school staff members, plus parents and students. Questions about Cline's management of school budgets were also raised during the hearings.

In his defense, Cline denied that he was enraged or that he used profanity during the instances cited. He conceded that he had engaged in altercations with certain personnel but denied use of profanity or other unprofessional behavior. Three citizens and four board members gave testimony in Cline's defense.

Cline responded to compaints about budgets, explaining that pressing classroom needs necessitated delaying various purchasing plans, and he furnished a copy of a September memorandum informing the entire staff about the condition of the school budget. Testimony was given to support his claim that he visited with individual teachers about budgetary restrictions.

Questions for Discussion

1. Consider the complaints against Cline separately. Is the alleged demonstration of anger indicative of a problem in professional ethics?
2. If you were a member of the ethics commission and assumed that the alleged complaints had substantive support, what would you recommend?
3. How well did Cline observe an acceptable level of prudence? Of formality?
4. As discussed in chapter four, the philosophy of experimentalism emphasized the tenets of democracy and the collective use of intelligence as a process to determine moral rules. Do you think that Cline would use this process to determine right behavior?

CASE #18: THE IDA CROSSMAN EPISODE

When school had started in September, teacher Ida Crossman had not seemed to be her usual professional self. Her principal, Wilbur Higgins, became increasingly concerned as her condition worsened. She began by showing up slightly late in the morning, and her absenteeisms increased steadily. Eventually, she was marginal at best in the classroom. In addition, her physical appearance underwent a similar deterioration.

Higgins discussed Crossman's tardiness with her when it was first brought to his attention. Though she assured him that her behavior would improve, he was forced to talk to her several more times as her condition worsened. These confrontations became increasingly unpleasant for both of them.

Higgins eventually suggested she see a doctor, and he hoped this would solve her problems. Nonetheless, he heard rumors about her behavior and saw for himself that she was becoming increasingly ineffective. Crossman offered to resign before the end of the term, but Higgins suggested she take special leave and plan to return in January. She agreed but returned in January and asked to resign again. Higgins suggested she take a few more days, but a week later returned and resigned over Higgins' objections.

Questions for Discussion

1. This case may present a situation in which Wilbur Higgins is forced into a conflict of ethical values. He demonstrates the capacity for caring, but how far may one press this in the face of possible irresponsibility for the educational welfare of the children in Crossman's class?
2. Was Crossman treated in consistency with recognized ethical principles?
3. Should Higgins have been more inclined to accept the first offer of resignation?
4. Should he have accepted her resignation when he did under the circumstances?

CASE #19: THE LAKELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT CASE

In August, Harold Hayes became Lakeland School District superintendent. The school board had counseled Hayes that changes were needed in the instructional program and in the schools' administrative practices. Hayes made higher retention rate of students and improvements in employee insurance plans personal priorities. However, his actions in these two areas precipitated conflicts with teachers, resulting in charges of unprofessional conduct by the teachers' association.

Hayes began to discuss with school principals his concern that grading standards might be too rigid. He particularly cited Edison High School and conducted several discussions with Ron Blass, the principal there. He sent a memorandum to Blass, asking him to explore the situation and report results. After several months, Hayes was not getting the action he wanted from Blass and decided that the principal's termination was the only answer.

The Blass termination caused considerable faculty reaction, with several teachers supporting the principal. Controversy later erupted over the dismissal of an Edison High teacher by Hayes.

Other allegations of unprofessional conduct by Hayes involved censor-

ship of the student newspaper, changing insurance companies for health insurance, and the use of an uncertified student teacher to teach without the supervision of a certified teacher.

The censorship issue was precipitated by a publicaton of a student newspaper story about the resignation of 13 teachers. The teachers' association charged that Hayes "willingly, knowingly, and intentionally caused suppression and deletions of newsworthy items in the May issue of the student newspaper." The claimants charged that this was an unprofessional act. Hayes, however, denied making any changes in the article, claiming he told the new principal to handle the situation.

Concerning the change in insurance companies, Mr. Hayes claimed his decision to change from Blue Cross-Blue Shield to Midwestern Life was based on the fact that Midwestern Life offered the "best coverage for the money." Yet, leaders of the teachers' association disputed his claim, pointing to the fact that three teachers had to pay bills that would have been covered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

The fact that an uncertified student teacher taught English for eight days in the school without the supervision of a certified teacher was supported by the evidence given. However, Mr. Hayes contended that the situation was necessitated by the illness of the supervising teacher.

Questions for Discussion

1. One aspect of this case involves prudence in managing conflict. Did Harold Hayes observe an acceptable level of prudence in the way he worked with other administrators and the faculty?

2. Was there evidence of arbitrary use of authority by any of the participants?

CASE #20: LEARNING ABOUT THE SYSTEM

One of Evelyn Brown's first tasks as principal in an elementary school in the La Grange school district was to select a custodian prior to school opening. The director for classified personnel informed her that the policy was to recruit from a pool of custodians already employed but, for a variety of reasons, were temporarily unassigned. There were five such persons available to choose from at the time, and from them Brown selected Steven Seal.

Brown quickly became dissatisfied with Seal's work, which was sloppy and inconsistent. She met with him and, following the meeting, was confident that Seal's performance would improve. Unfortunately, this did not happen.

During the lunch break at a principals' meeting, Brown mentioned her concerns about Seal to some veteran principals in the system. Through these discussions, she discovered that Seal had passed through several schools because of his poor job performance. The principals explained to her that, because he was from an influential family, Seal was difficult to fire. He received inflated evaluatons to keep him in the school system. Therefore, Brown was "stuck" with him unless she could "pawn him off" on another school.

Questions for Discussion

This case raises some very basic issues. Keeping an incompetent employee or recommending their services to another school to get rid of them are seemingly unprofessional ways to deal with this situation. Yet, Evelyn Brown may be herself corrupted by the prevailing system. Surely, central office administrators must be aware that this practice is widespread.

1. Is inflating a person's evaluation in the hope that he or she will leave the school ethical?

2. Does the central office staff have a responsibility to stop this practice? If so, how should the staff proceed?

3. Evelyn Brown is obviously caught in a difficult situation. If she brings official charges against Seal, she risks the wrath of political leaders. Moreover, she might not be supported by the superintendent and board of education. Should she continue the system of "pawning off" Seal to some other unsuspecting principal? Or should she end the practice and risk problems for herself?

CASE #21: SUBTLE TEMPTATIONS

Eric Moeller's career in educational administration began when he was appointed assistant principal of Vorheis High School in Crescent City. A good position, it marked the beginning of a steady move upward in the school system to superintendent and finally to chief state school officer.

While assistant superintendent of schools in Crescent City, Moeller experienced additional good fortune by being cut in on a group speculating in land for community development. Crescent City was experiencing fast growth in population and the baby boom was crowding the schools. Eric and his colleagues were in a good position to predict where future development was probable because the regular school plant surveys, which were conducted every three years to keep up with pupil growth, pinpointed areas of potential rapid development.

By the time Eric had become superintendent of schools in Crescent City, his personal wealth was estimated as approaching a million dollars. To most observers Moeller's wealth gave him the kind of independence from board intimidation needed by educators. Moeller served as superintendent of the Crescent City schools with distinction.

Most educators in the state felt that Moeller was an effective, influential chief state school officer. He had stood up for what was right for education and in the process had taken broadside attacks from powerful political groups.

Yet, Moeller had an albatross about his neck that had followed him since the last two years of his career as superintendent in Crescent City and now as chief state school officer. A reporter, Nell Sloan, had persistently attempted to tie him to business deals that might raise the questions of a conflict of interest. Moeller and his friends were unable to convince the publisher that what Sloan was doing could be damaging to the progress of education in the state.

People were shocked when the state attorney general announced a grand jury investigation based on certain documented information presented in evidence of wrongdoing on the part of Moeller. These charges involved sales of school supplies to the state by a corporation of which he was a principal stockholder, soliciting bribes, and so on. In all, 15 charges of irregular conduct were brought by a grand jury.

Questions for Discussion

1. How does a school administrator decide whether personal business arrangements conflict with the public interest?

2. Should an administrator ever derive personal gain from the sale of supplies, books, or other materials to the school system? Should an administrator publicly endorse goods or services sold by private businesses or agencies?

3. What are some guidelines to follow to prevent a conflict of interest when one invests in outside business arrangements?

CASE #22: THE EVALUATION OF EMERALD DONAHUE

Wilson High School in Jamestown School District #2 held a commendable reputation in the community. Buford O'Brien was well liked by parents as the "firm-handed but fair" principal. Within the past two years, however, O'Brien felt that he should retire and let Timothy Reynolds, the assistant principal, "take over WHS." O'Brien tendered his resignation as the principal with the expectation that Reynolds would be his replacement.

Consistent with affirmative action guidelines, the position was widely advertised. In addition, a special search and screen committee was established, including a university professor, several local teachers, and three parents. After a thorough review of all applicants, the committee recommended four outstanding candidates for consideration including Reynolds.

Considerable influence was being used in support of Reynolds' candidacy. Although Reynolds disavowed any part in this activity, which was described by him as "spontaneous support," some board members expressed informally to the superintendent their concern about a "well-directed campaign" in support of Reynolds. Moreover, as the superintendent, Mildred Huntley, reviewed and interviewed all four candidates, she became convinced that, although Timothy Reynolds was a very good secondman, he was not the best person among the group for the top position in the school. She recommended to the board that Michael McIntyre be appointed principal with the understanding of McIntyre and the board that Reynolds would continue as assistant principal.

Huntley realized that her decision was not a popular one and indeed it was not. After considerable undercurrent of grumbling opposition to her recommendation, which was supported by a 4-3 vote of the board, things moved back toward normal relations.

McIntyre met in numerous discussions with Reynolds and Huntley preparing for the upcoming fall session. One of the assignments required by the board that was given to Reynolds was evaluation of teachers. As an administrator Reynolds often referred to himself as a "team player" and as a builder of good relations among faculty members. Although Reynolds did not like the teacher evaluation task, he did not feel he could protest.

Effective in January of the school year Emerald Donahue, head of the English department, was reassigned by the principal to a teaching position. The leader of the teachers' union expressed to McIntyre and the superintendent that this action was in violation of their contract. The union appealed the action and the matter went to arbitration.

During testimony at the arbitration hearing, Donahue's competence was questioned by McIntyre and Reynolds. However, a copy of the evaluation form for Donahue showed that she was rated satisfactory or above average on all items on the form. In his testimony Reynolds stated that a number of items in her performance had been less than satisfactory. When confronted with the discrepancy between the formal evaluation record and his testimony, he testified that he had been aware of her defi-

ciencies but was reluctant to record them on the evaluation form because he did not want to cause controversy. Consequently, he testified that he had downplayed the information about the deficiencies on the evaluation form.

The arbitrator ruled in favor of the grievant and in the awards statement designated that Donahue should be returned to her position as head of the English department at the next appropriate contract time.

Questions for Discussion

1. How would you describe Reynolds' basic character? Did Superintendent Huntley demonstrate good character?
2. Did Reynolds fulfill the standards set by the AASA Code of Ethics?
3. What are the moral obligations of school administrators in evaluating teachers?
4. Did McIntyre use good common sense in the delegation of authority?

APPENDIX B

STATEMENT OF ETHICS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

An educational administrator's professional behavior must conform to an ethical code. The code must be idealistic and at the same time practical, so that it can apply reasonably to all educational administrators. The administrator acknowledges that the schools belong to the public they serve for the purpose of providing educational opportunities to all. However the administrator assumes the responsibility for providing professional leadership in the school and community. This responsibility requires the administrator to maintain standards of exemplary professional conduct. It must be recognized that the administrator's actions will be viewed and appraised by the community, professional associates, and students. To these ends, the administrator subscribes to the following statements of standards.

The educational administrator:

1. Makes the well-being of students the fundamental value of all decision making and actions.
2. Fulfills professional responsibilities with honesty and integrity.
3. Supports the principle of due process and protects the civil and human rights of all individuals.
4. Obeys local, state, and national laws and does not knowingly join or support organizations that advocate, directly or indirectly, the overthrow of the government.
5. Implements the governing board of education's policies and administrative rules and regulations.
6. Pursues appropriate measures to correct those laws, policies, and regulations that are not consistent with sound educational goals.
7. Avoids using positions for personal gain through political, social, religious, economic, or other influence.
8. Accepts academic degrees or professional certification only from duly accredited institutions.
9. Maintains the standards and seeks to improve the effectiveness of the profession through research and continuing professional development.
10. Honors all contracts until fulfillment, release, or dissolution mutually agreed upon by all parties to contract.

Approved by AASA Executive Committee, May 1, 1981 Embraced by NCAR, May 1976

REFERENCES

American Association of School Administrators. *AASA Statement of Ethics for School Administrators and Procedural Guidelines*. Arlington, Va.: 1976.

American Association of School Administrators. *Building Public Confidence in Our Schools*. Arlington, Va.: 1982.

American Association of School Administrators. *Champions of Children*. Arlington, Va.: 1979.

Appleby, P.H. *Morality and Administration in Democratic Government*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1952.

Banner, W.A. *Ethics: An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968.

Barnard, C.I. *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Beach, W., and Niebuhr, H.R. (eds.) *Christian Ethics: Sources of the Living Tradition* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Bentham, J. In *A Fragment on Government*. Edited by F.C. Montague. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Berkson, I.B. *Ethics, Politics, and Education*. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Books, 1968.

Bobbitt, F. *The Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1918.

Burke, E. *Burke's Politics*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1949.

Cooper, T.L. *The Responsible Administrator*. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1982.

Culbertson, J.A. "Three Epistemologies and the Study of Educational Administration." *UCEA Review* (1981). (1), 1-5.

De George, R.T. *Business Ethics*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1982.

Dewey, J. *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1916.

Dewey, J. *The Quest for Certainty*. New York: Putnam Publishers, 1929.

Durant, W. *The Story of Philosophy*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1961.

Facione, P.A., Scherer, D., and Attig, T. *Values and Society*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

Feldman, F. *Introductory Ethics*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

Fletcher, J.F. *Situation Ethics: The New Morality*. Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1966.

Goldman, A.H. *The Moral Foundation of Professional Ethics*. N.J.: Rowan and Littlefield, 1980.

Graff, O.B., Street, C.M., Kimbrough, R.B. and Dykes, A.R. *Philosophic Theory and Practice in Educational Administration*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1966.

Grassian, V. *Moral Reasoning*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Griffiths, D.E. *Administrative Theory*. New York: Appleton Century-Crofts, 1959.

Heilbronner, R.L. *The Worldly Philosophers: The Lives, Times, and Ideas of the Great Economic Thinkers* (5th ed.). New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953.

Hoffer, E. *The True Believer*. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.
Immegart, G.L. and Burroughs, J.M. (eds.). *Ethics and the School Administrator*. Danville, Ill.: Interstate, 1970.
Jay, A. *Management and Machiavelli*. New York: Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1967.
Jordan, R.P. "High-Flying Tulsa." *National Geographic* (September 1983).
Kant, I. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. A.J. Patton (trans.). New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
Kimbrough, R.B. and Nunnery, M.Y. *Educational Administration: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1983. Chapters 12 & 13.
Kohlberg, L. "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive Developmental Approach." In *Moral Development and Behavior*. Edited by T. Lickona. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1976.
Maguire, D.C. *The Moral Choice*. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1978.
Mann, J.A. and Kreyche, Gerald F. (eds.), *Approaches to Morality*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1966.
Mayeroff, M. *On Caring*. New York: Perennial Library, 1971.
Mill, J.S. *Utilitarianism*. New York: Dutton, 1951.
Morris, V.C. and Young, P. *Philosophy and the American School* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976.
Norman, R. *The Moral Philosophers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
Ostrander, R.H. and Dethy, R.C. *A Values Approach to Educational Administration*. New York: American Book Co., 1968.
Peters, R.S. *Ethics and Education*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1967.
Rand, A. *The Virtue of Selfishness: A New Concept of Egoism*. New York: New American Library, 1964.
Riesman, D. *The Lonely Crowd*. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1953.
Rogers, C.R. *Counseling and Psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1942.
Stroh, G.W. *American Ethical Thought*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, Inc., 1979.
Swain, C.H. "Organizational Outcomes of Socializing Between Superordinates and Subordinates in a Selected Educational Organization." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1983.
Titus, H. *Ethics for Today*. New York: American Book Co., 1954.
Walton, C.C. *Ethos and the Executive: Values in Managerial Decision Making*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1969.
Warnack, M. *Ethics Since 1900*. London: Oxford University Press, 1978.
Weinreich-Haste, H. and Lock, D. (eds.). *Morality in the Making*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1983.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The American Association of School Administrators expresses its appreciation to those who contributed to this project. From the beginning this has been a cooperative endeavor of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), and the University of Florida.

The original manuscript was prepared by Ralph B. Kimbrough, professor of educational administration at the University of Florida at Gainesville. William H. Price and John C. Wahl, graduate assistants, assisted in preparing the case studies and in other aspects of the project. Walt Turner, AASA associate executive director, served as staff liaison for the project. Anne Dees, AASA publications manager, served as staff editor with the assistance of Joanne Kaldy, AASA managing editor.

Members and corresponding members of the AASA Ethics Committee reviewed the manuscript and made valuable suggestions. Those members were:

CURRENT AASA ETHICS COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairperson
T. Chris Mattocks, superintendent
Glacier School District 15
Cut Bank, Montana

Fritz Hess, superintendent
E. Syracuse—Minoa Central Schools
East Syracuse, New York

Thelma King, principal
Stamford High School
Stamford, Connecticut

R. J. Rehwaldt, superintendent
Mankato School District 77
Mankato, Minnesota

Arthur W. Steller, superintendent
Mercer County Schools
Princeton, West Virginia

Executive Committee Liaison
Raymond O. Shelton, superintendent
Hillsborough County Schools
Tampa, Florida

Staff Liaison
Walter G. Turner, associate executive director
AASA
Arlington, Virginia

CURRENT CORRESPONDING MEMBERS TO THE AASA ETHICS COMMITTEE

Gladys S. Britt, director
South Central Regional Education Center
Carthage, North Carolina

Raymond E. Dowling, superintendent of schools
380 Church Street
Naugatuck, Connecticut

Judith A. Emge, administrative principal
Ojibwa Indiana School
Belcourt, North Dakota

Robert C. Lasley, district superintendent
Holtville Unified School District
Holtville, California

Jack J. Ward, superintendent of schools
Bloomfield, New Mexico

FORMER MEMBERS OF AASA ETHICS COMMITTEE

Chairperson
John G. Alford, Jr., assistant state superintendent
for planning, research and evaluation
State Board of Education
Springfield, Illinois

Walter J. Ziegler, superintendent
Fullerton Union High School District
Fullerton, California

FORMER CORRESPONDING MEMBERS TO THE AASA ETHICS COMMITTEE

William F. Schaefer, III, superintendent
Madison School District 38
Phoenix, Arizona

Lee A. Wicklund, director of curriculum and instruction
North Bend Public Schools
North Bend, Oregon